

MISSOURI.

Moses M. Adams to be postmaster at Seneca, in the county of Newton and State of Missouri.

Isidore Schwartz to be postmaster at Ilasco, in the county of Ralls and State of Missouri.

William L. H. Silliman to be postmaster at Clarksville, in the county of Pike and State of Missouri.

MONTANA.

John C. Sorenson to be postmaster at Glendive, in the county of Dawson and State of Montana.

NEW YORK.

Lewis B. Jewell to be postmaster at Ovid, in the county of Seneca and State of New York.

Charles E. Morgan to be postmaster at West Winfield, in the county of Herkimer and State of New York.

NORTH CAROLINA.

Estella Cameron to be postmaster at Rockingham, in the county of Richmond and State of North Carolina.

Clarence M. McCall to be postmaster at Marion, in the county of McDowell and State of North Carolina.

OKLAHOMA.

Rolland D. Barnes to be postmaster at Eldorado, in the county of Greer and Territory of Oklahoma.

OREGON.

Marshall E. Merwin to be postmaster at Independence, in the county of Polk and State of Oregon.

PENNSYLVANIA.

Thomas H. Bailey to be postmaster at Mansfield, in the county of Tioga and State of Pennsylvania.

William M. Bennett to be postmaster at Nazareth, in the county of Northampton and State of Pennsylvania.

Henry M. Brownback to be postmaster at Norristown, in the county of Montgomery and State of Pennsylvania.

William E. Champaign to be postmaster at Wellsboro, in the county of Tioga and State of Pennsylvania.

David P. Hughes to be postmaster at East Mauch Chunk, in the county of Carbon and State of Pennsylvania.

John B. Griffiths to be postmaster at Jermy, in the county of Lackawanna and State of Pennsylvania.

Ferdinand K. Hill to be postmaster at Sunbury, in the county of Northumberland and State of Pennsylvania.

John T. Palmer to be postmaster at Stroudsburg, in the county of Monroe and State of Pennsylvania.

Jesse Ransberry to be postmaster at East Stroudsburg, in the county of Monroe and State of Pennsylvania.

TEXAS.

Lucy Breen to be postmaster at Mineola, in the county of Wood and State of Texas.

John M. Cape to be postmaster at San Marcos, in the county of Hays and State of Texas.

Josephine Chesley to be postmaster at Bellville, in the county of Austin and State of Texas.

Garfield Hershner to be postmaster at Angleton, in the county of Brazoria and State of Texas.

Leander Hopkins to be postmaster at Ferris, in the county of Ellis and State of Texas.

William D. McCaslin to be postmaster at Detroit, in the county of Red River and State of Texas.

Bassett R. Miles to be postmaster at Luling, in the county of Caldwell and State of Texas.

Edward W. Morten to be postmaster at Farmersville, in the county of Collin and State of Texas.

William Myers to be postmaster at Seguin, in the county of Guadalupe and State of Texas.

William D. Rathjen to be postmaster at Canadian, in the county of Hemphill and State of Texas.

Elizabeth Rhea to be postmaster at Groesbeck, in the county of Limestone and State of Texas.

Jay S. Richard to be postmaster at Itasca, in the county of Hill and State of Texas.

Ulysses G. Roach to be postmaster at Celeste, in the county of Hunt and State of Texas.

William E. Sayers, sr., to be postmaster at Bay City, in the county of Matagorda and State of Texas.

Seth B. Strong to be postmaster at Houston, in the county of Harris and State of Texas.

E. R. Yeary to be postmaster at Alice, in the county of Nueces and State of Texas.

WISCONSIN.

Herbert A. Pease to be postmaster at Cumberland, in the county of Barron and State of Wisconsin.

WYOMING.

Harry A. Thompson to be postmaster at Sunrise, in the county of Laramie and State of Wyoming.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

WEDNESDAY, February 13, 1907.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

REVENUE-CUTTER SERVICE.

Mr. CUSHMAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (S. 925) for the construction of a steam vessel for the Revenue-Cutter Service, for duty in the district of Puget Sound, with House amendments amended, discharge the committee from further consideration of the same, and that the House disagree to the amendment of the Senate to the amendments of the House and ask for a conference of the two Houses thereon.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will ask the gentleman if this is simply unanimous consent to go to a conference?

Mr. CUSHMAN. That is all; yes, sir.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered, and the Chair announces the following conferees on the part of the House: Mr. MANN, Mr. CUSHMAN, and Mr. RYAN.

MINORITY REPORT, POST-OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HEDGE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the further extension of the time heretofore granted to members of the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads to file a minority report on the post-office appropriation bill until the hour of adjournment Friday. This request is made on account of the absence of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the time for filing the minority report on the post-office appropriation bill, as indicated, be extended until the hour of adjournment on Friday. Is there objection?

Mr. FINLEY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I will ask the gentleman what is the necessity for extending the time?

Mr. HEDGE. For the sake of peace, I will say to the gentleman. I want to confer with the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. OVERSTREET], and the gentleman knows that he is unavoidably absent.

Mr. FINLEY. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES.

A message, in writing, from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. LATTA, one of his secretaries.

PUBLIC LANDS.

The SPEAKER laid before the House a message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on the Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

[For message see Senate proceedings.]

COMMITTEE APPOINTMENT.

The SPEAKER announced the following committee appointment:

Mr. DIXON of Montana to the Committee on Indian Affairs, vice Mr. CURTIS, resigned.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the naval appropriation bill, with Mr. SHERMAN in the chair.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, there was pending at the adjournment yesterday a point of order made to an amendment offered by myself to line 22, on page 13 of the bill, under the Bureau of Ordnance. The amendment that I offered provided that the ammunition and supplies already on hand under the appropriation for the increase of the Navy should be transferred to ordnance and ordnance stores, and also the further provision that the ammunition and other supplies already contracted for should be transferred to the ordnance and ordnance stores. The question was whether or not the Secretary of the Navy had the

authority under the general law to do it at the present time. Section 1547 of the Revised Statutes provides that the orders, regulations, and instructions issued by the Secretary of the Navy prior to July 14, 1862, with such alterations as he may since have adopted, with the approval of the President, shall be recognized as the regulations of the Navy, subject to alterations adopted in the same manner. That is the general authority under which these regulations have been adopted. By a decision of the Supreme Court in the case of *Smith v. Whitney* (116 U. S., 181), when Mr. Whitney was Secretary of the Navy, these regulations have the force of law.

Now, section 3 of the regulations provides:

That the business of the Department of the Navy shall be distributed in such manner as the Secretary of the Navy shall judge to be expedient and proper under the following bureaus: First, the Bureau of Yards and Docks; second, the Bureau of Equipment; third, the Bureau of Navigation; fourth, the Bureau of Ordnance; fifth, the Bureau of Construction and Repair; sixth, the Bureau of Steam Engineering; seventh, the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts; eighth, the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery.

I submit this to the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair begs to suggest that what the gentleman from Illinois has read indicates or shows that the Secretary of the Navy has authority to make certain classifications, etc. The amendment which the gentleman on yesterday offered is a direction to the Secretary—a statutory, mandatory direction to the Secretary to do something which under the law he has authority to do in his discretion. This, then, is a direction where the statute gives the Secretary discretion; therefore it seems to the Chair that it is a legislative provision, and obnoxious to the rule.

Mr. FOSS. That is made upon the recommendation of the Secretary.

The CHAIRMAN. That may be. The Chair, of course, does not enter into the question of the propriety of the legislative provision, but the matter as to whether or not it can be done upon an appropriation bill, and the Chair thinks it can not be done, and sustains the point of order. The Clerk will read.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment which I have sent to the Clerk's desk. I want to insert it where we left off yesterday.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 20, after line 9, insert:

"Depots for coal: To enable the Secretary of the Navy to execute the provisions of section 1552 of the Revised Statutes authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to establish at such places as he may deem necessary suitable depots for coal and other fuel for supplying the steamships of war, \$225,000."

Mr. MANN. I reserve the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Chairman, I think no point of order lies against it, but the gentleman may reserve it, nevertheless, if he thinks it goes. The circumstances which surround this proposition are as follows: In the first place, the Secretary of the Navy, I understand, in making up his budget recommended \$400,000 for depots for coal, but the committee in its wisdom has inserted no items whatever. The particular thing I have in mind is the establishment of a coal depot at the city of San Diego. I have the assurance of the Department that if the money is appropriated according to this amendment there will be one put there. That is the selfish interest I have in the matter. Now, the general interest which the House will have is as follows: There are on the Atlantic seaboard, between a point in Maine and swinging around to New Orleans, fourteen coaling stations, with three more in the islands, two in Porto Rico, and one in Cuba, making seventeen ports at which they can take coal along the Atlantic seaboard.

On the Pacific seaboard there are two, one at Seattle and one at San Francisco; none south of San Francisco until you reach the southern point of the peninsula of Lower California. Around in the Bay of California there is a very small place where they can take a little coal in case of necessity. Now, it would seem to me that this is not entirely a safe condition in which to leave our Navy on the Pacific side, and it is somewhat aggravated by the further fact there are no supplies of domestic coal at any of the seaports of California for the simple reason that California no longer uses coal. There is not a railroad or street-car system of any kind in that section of the country that now uses coal, but fuel oil has taken the whole field. If you should have occasion to coal the vessels of the Navy at any port in California you would be utterly unable to buy a hundred tons of coal at any place, and under those circumstances it seems to me that it would be wise and proper for the Government to protect itself by providing a coal supply at convenient points along the coast, and San Diego Harbor is a very desirable place for vessels to enter and take coal. The Navy Department already owns land on which a

coaling station would be placed with a magnificent depth of water. I therefore hope that the House in its wisdom will see the necessity of providing for coal supplies in connection with its operations in the Pacific Ocean.

I suppose no one is inclined to raise any war scare, but we maintain a navy on the theory that we may have war, and I suppose there is not a man here who does not feel that as good an opportunity, at least, to have a war as anywhere is on the Pacific side, and the best way to avoid it will be to be amply well prepared to meet it. I think there should be an additional coal supply on the Pacific Ocean, and I hope the amendment will be adopted.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment reported again?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, as I understood it before, it was a specific proposition. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, section 1552 provides that the Secretary of the Navy may establish at such places as he may deem necessary suitable depots of coal and other fuel for the supply of steamships of war. It is within his discretion to establish these coaling plants wherever he may see fit, and of course he could establish one at San Diego Harbor. Now, we have a large number of coaling plants. They are scattered all the way from Frenchmans Bay, on the coast of Maine, along the Atlantic coast, the Gulf coast, and the Pacific coast, and then there are some in the island possessions. They are about twenty-eight or thirty in number. On the Pacific coast we have a coaling plant at Sitka, Alaska, with a capacity of 5,000 tons; and then we have a large coaling plant at Puget Sound, Washington, with a capacity of 22,900 tons. That is our largest coaling plant, I think, anywhere. Then at Mare Island, which is just above the city of San Francisco, we have a coaling plant with a capacity of 20,000 tons; and now we are building a coaling plant in San Francisco Bay, near the city of San Francisco, which will have a capacity of 15,000 tons.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. At what point is that?

Mr. FOSS. That is California City Point, I think.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Does the gentleman know how far that is from San Diego?

Mr. FOSS. It is right there at San Francisco, in San Francisco Bay.

Mr. SMITH of California. How far is it from San Diego?

Mr. FOSS. San Diego is, I presume, 450 miles farther south.

Mr. SMITH of California. Six or seven hundred miles.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss] yield to his colleague [Mr. Butler]?

Mr. FOSS. I do.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. I would like to ask the gentleman from California [Mr. SMITH] what the real distance is between San Diego and San Francisco?

Mr. SMITH of California. The distance by rail down the coast, and that is quite as direct as the coast line, is about 625 miles from San Francisco to San Diego.

Mr. FOSS. Down below San Diego we have a small coaling plant, at Pinchilique, in California Bay, if I remember rightly.

Mr. SMITH of California. How far is that below the international line?

Mr. FOSS. I do not know how far it is. Now, Mr. Chairman, it is really a question of whether or not it is advisable to establish very many of these large coaling plants. In the first place they cost a large sum of money. They cost about four or five hundred thousand dollars, and when you take into consideration the fact that a ship can sail into any port or harbor and get coal, and the further fact also, that at every navy-yard we have a coaling plant, it is a question of how far we ought to go in the establishment of these great coaling plants at other points.

As I said a moment ago, the cost of the large coaling plant will amount to \$400,000 or \$500,000. The cost of the maintenance of that plant will probably be at least 5 per cent. The cost of repairs would be in the neighborhood of 5 per cent. The cost of repairs and the cost of maintenance in a single year would equal almost the value of the coal in the plant, as, for instance, if its capacity was about ten or twenty thousand tons. So that it is an important proposition to be considered as to how far we ought to go in the establishment of these separate coaling stations for coaling ships. Now, we have expended so far—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I will ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss]

asks unanimous consent that his time may be extended for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of California. I would like to ask a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSS. I would like to finish my statement first.

Mr. SMITH of California. Then I would like to ask a question.

Mr. FOSS. Yes. We have expended so far, from 1898 to 1904, \$3,340,000 outside of the appropriation at the navy-yards, as my figures show. This year we did not make any appropriation, because we found that in the report of the Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts there was an unexpended balance of \$779,528.18. This appears on page 7 of the report of the Chief of the Bureau of Supplies and Accounts, in which he gives the balances on June 30, 1906. Now, we thought with that amount of money already unexpended, with full authority now left in the Secretary of the Navy to expend this money where he might see fit, that he had enough to work on during the coming year; and that is the position of the committee. He can still establish this coal plant; and we thought with this large unexpended balance on hand that it would be unwise to make a larger appropriation this year.

Mr. SMITH of California. I would like to interrogate the chairman of the committee, if he pleases. I do not want the gentleman to feel that I am antagonizing the wisdom of the committee.

Mr. FOSS. I understand.

Mr. SMITH of California. About this sum which is left over. That is already set aside for the construction of coaling plants in process of construction, is it not, at Guantanamo and at California City Point and one other place?

Mr. FOSS. It is all in the discretion of the Secretary of the Navy, and he can expend all this amount right on the coaling station at California City Point if he wants to.

Mr. SMITH of California. But what I mean is, that he has already begun the construction of coaling stations that will consume all that \$700,000 that appears to be yet on hand.

Mr. FOSS. One at Guantanamo and also one at California City Point.

Mr. SMITH of California. And that will consume the amount of money now on hand?

Mr. FOSS. Undoubtedly it will consume it—that is, he will spend it during the coming year.

Mr. SMITH of California. So there is no fund available which he might divert to a new coaling station on the Pacific coast without stopping the work on those already under way.

Mr. FOSS. He can stop the work at any place. If an emergency arises in which it is necessary to have a coaling station at San Diego Harbor, why he can immediately establish one. That is all within his own power, under this law, which says he may "establish at such places as he may deem necessary suitable depots of coal and other fuel for supply of the steamships of war."

Mr. SMITH of California. One other question. You spoke about the Navy Department being able to buy coal from private holders on the Pacific coast. What information have you as to the supply of coal in any of the ports along that coast?

Mr. FOSS. Well, I have no special information. I understand that we buy American coal on the Pacific coast and also buy coal from England.

Mr. SMITH of California. I want to say, for the information of the chairman of the committee, you can not buy a ton of coal at any port between San Francisco and San Diego, and for the reason that California no longer uses coal as fuel. You will agree with me that the coal that the Navy uses on the Pacific coast is freighted there from England or from the Eastern States. There is no coal produced on the Pacific coast within a thousand miles of tide water anywhere except in the State of Washington, near Puget Sound.

Mr. FOSS. It is true that what American coal we use there we have to freight there.

Mr. SMITH of California. But there is no private stock, and, as I understood, the gentleman made that a part of his argument against having a new coaling station. There are no private stocks of coal at all in California. I was at Port Harford and Santa Barbara, San Diego, and Hueneme during the last year, and I know that there is no coal at any of those places on the Pacific coast, for the reason that every railroad there and every steam enterprise is now using mineral oil for fuel. The Spreckels company formerly imported coal for distribution to the Santa Fe and other railroads, but since the railroads have changed to oil burners in their locomotives there is no supply of coal kept there. So that shows the necessity of having coal there in time of an emergency, for if there were an

enemy's fleet off the coast, all it would have to do would be to hover around the entrance to San Francisco Harbor until every vessel of the Navy was without coal, and we might be thousands of miles from a supply of coal. I am not stating this in a spirit of criticism of this committee for this condition of affairs, but I think it ought not to be permitted to exist; that the continuation of this condition of affairs might become very serious.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from California.

The question was taken; and the Chairman announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SMITH of California. Division!

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 13, noes 44.

So the amendment was rejected.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 20, line 8, after the word "dollars," insert:
"Provided, That except in cases of emergency no part of this appropriation shall be expended for coal in the Philippine Islands, except for American coal purchased from the lowest responsible bidder for coal delivered."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. I will be glad to answer it.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Please explain the purpose of your amendment.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. I can hardly make any explanation which will be plainer than the amendment itself.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. It was read hurriedly. I am not complaining of the reading, but I did not hear it distinctly.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. I will be glad to explain it. It is simply this: I provide that for all the coal in the Philippine Islands the Navy Department be instructed to, as far as this appropriation is concerned, buy its necessary coal—American coal—from the lowest bidder for coal delivered there. Under this amendment all the coal that is bought there except in case of emergency must be American coal, but it will be American coal bought from the lowest responsible bidders for coal delivered there.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. That is good tariff doctrine, so far as he has gone.

Several MEMBERS. What is the amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the amendment will be again reported.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend that amendment by adding the words:

Which coal shall have been transported in American bottoms.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania offers an amendment to the amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add to the amendment the words "which coal shall have been transported in American bottoms."

Mr. FITZGERALD. I make the point of order against that amendment that it changes existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order against the amendment to the amendment.

Mr. SULZER. I hope the gentleman from New York will withdraw that point of order. The Democratic party has been fighting for many years to build up our merchant marine and transport our goods in our own ships.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York desire to discuss the point of order? Will the gentleman refer the Chair to the statute?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I can refer the Chair to the law in a few minutes; but I can state now the substance of the law. There is no dispute about it. At present all supplies for the Navy must be carried in American bottoms, unless, in the opinion of the President, the prices are unreasonable or excessive, when he may direct that they be carried in foreign bottoms. This amendment changes that law by removing the discretion of the President.

Mr. OLMSTED. I think, as this is a limitation, it is not subject to the point of order; but I am willing to add to the words of my amendment:

Unless in the opinion of the President the charges therefor shall be unreasonable.

That will meet the objection of the gentleman from New York.

The CHAIRMAN. The clerk will again report the amendment as modified.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add to the amendment the words "unless in the opinion of the President the charges therefor shall be unreasonable."

Mr. FITZGERALD. I still make the point of order against that, as it is impossible to tell the effect of it.

Mr. GILBERT. I offer this additional amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. No additional amendment is in order.

Mr. GILBERT. I offer it as a substitute, then.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman offers a substitute for the amendment.

Mr. GILBERT. In addition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania I want to add these words:

Without regard to the flag under which the vessel is operated.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kentucky must offer something as a substitute for the whole proposition.

Mr. GILBERT. I am offering the amendment, with these additional words, as a substitute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman must offer a substitute. He can not offer another amendment.

Mr. GILBERT. I am offering a substitute, in the language of the gentleman's amendment, with the additional words suggested by myself.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the proposed substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute for the pending amendment, the words:

"Provided, That, except in case of emergency, no part of this appropriation shall be expended for coal in the Philippine Islands, unless for American coal purchased from the lowest responsible bidder for coal delivered, which coal shall be transported in American bottoms, unless, in the opinion of the President, the charge therefor is unreasonable, without regard to the flag under which said coal is transported."

Mr. GILBERT. This amendment causes a smile on the faces of some people, but it is abundantly established that there are about 250,000 tons of American bottoms sailing and operating under foreign flags. I am sure the gentleman from Pennsylvania has in mind an effort to encourage the purchase of coal that has been shipped in vessels that are operated under the American flag, but there are a great many vessels operated under the British flag and under the German flag and other flags that are to all intents and purposes American vessels, owned by American citizens or American corporations, and yet, not having been constructed in American shipyards, they are being operated under foreign flags.

Mr. HUGHES. I would like to inquire of the gentleman from North Carolina why his amendment is necessary?

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I am glad to inform the gentleman. On yesterday afternoon we had a full debate on another amendment which I offered and which was defeated by the committee. One of the objections to that amendment was that under it the Navy Department would be authorized to buy foreign coal in the Philippines, and some gentlemen insisted that they would oppose any proposition that gave permission in this appropriation bill to buy foreign coal. So this amendment is limited to American coal. I will say further that if this amendment is adopted we can buy American coal in the Philippine Islands for \$2.75 a ton cheaper than we can buy the coal here and have it transported in American steamers.

Why should we not permit a dealer in American coal who can carry other goods to the Philippine Islands in any bottom he may see fit, why should we not permit him to carry coal under any flag, and why not let the Government save \$2.75 a ton on its coal?

In that very full document that the chairman of the committee published in connection with his remarks yesterday, gentlemen will find that the Government had in the last two months offers of 50,000 tons of American coal delivered in the Philippine Islands at \$7.25 a ton, and another 50,000 tons under other conditions at \$7.50 a ton, while in that same document it appears that the Government has been unable to get a single American steamer to transport coal there for this year for less than \$7.50, and not a single American steamer wants to transport coal there even at the price at which he can buy American coal in the Philippines, and it seems to me that this is a business proposition.

This Congress would not undertake to say that an American citizen in the Philippines should not buy goods there of American manufacture unless those goods were transported in American bottoms. Why do you wish to tie your Government and the public Treasury to a rule that you do not and will not apply to American citizens? You will let American citizens buy American shoes in the Philippines, you will let American citizens buy American lumber in the Philippines, and it matters not how it got there. Now, why not let the Government buy American coal there on the open market?

Mr. HUGHES. Mr. Chairman, I asked the gentleman from North Carolina a question, and I expected him to confine his remarks to the answer to my question. I did not expect him to go on and make a tariff speech.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. I have not mentioned the tariff.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from North Carolina has expired.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask, in the first place, whether there is a point of order pending?

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is pending. It was reserved by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. Not to the original amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. No; to the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. OLMSTED. Does the gentleman from New York insist on his point of order?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Of course. It changes existing law.

Mr. OLMSTED. The gentleman reserved it?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I reserved it.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Chairman, I wish to say that the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina is in substance and effect the same amendment we discussed yesterday and by a large majority voted down. His amendment now is that they shall purchase American coal, but it does not provide for the transportation of that coal in American vessels.

As the law now stands it is in the power of the President or the Secretary of the Navy to use foreign vessels if the rate charged by American vessels is, in their judgment, unreasonable. Therefore there is no danger of their being caught in any such corner as the gentleman from North Carolina anticipates. If American bottoms could not be obtained at reasonable rates, it is within the power of the President to obtain foreign bottoms, and therefore there is no occasion for the gentleman's amendment.

Now I wish to say a few words on the point of order. The amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina, as I understood its reading, is a limitation upon the appropriation. My amendment is germane to that, and is in itself a limitation and therefore not subject to a point of order at all. It does not change existing law. In fact, my amendment is in harmony with existing law and does not change existing law in any way. The amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina, and my amendment to his, constitute a limitation upon the appropriation in this bill for this year as far as it relates to coal to be shipped to the Philippines; but my amendment does not change existing law. I have so amended it as to conform to existing law, as the gentleman from New York states it to be.

The effect of my amendment is to put it right back, to neutralize the amendment of the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN], so as to comply with existing law, and require, as the law now does, that the coal shall be shipped in American bottoms, unless, in the opinion of the President, the rate charged for such transportation is unreasonable and excessive. My amendment, as existing law does, leaves it in the discretion of the President to employ other means of transportation if American vessels charge unreasonable rates. But so long as their rates are reasonable I think American bottoms should be given the preference. The gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LOUDENSLAGER] submitted official evidence yesterday that transportation rates are actually lower since the act of Congress has given American vessels a chance.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I only want to say just a word or two. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED] has so well expressed my views in regard to this matter that there is no need of wasting time by mere repetition.

I disagree entirely with my colleague, the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD], regarding this matter. For years the Democratic party has been endeavoring along constitutional lines to build up the American merchant marine on the Atlantic and Pacific coasts. Its policy is to build up by recurring to the policies of the early days of the Republic, by having all goods, wares, and merchandise coming in or going out of the United States carried in American bottoms by a just system of tonnage taxation or by discriminating duties.

I am surprised that any Democrat should object to this proposition of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, especially when it leaves the option in the hands of the President, so that if the American ship will not carry the coal as cheaply as the foreign ship he has the right to select the foreign ship.

I know a good deal about the Pacific coast; I go out there almost every summer. I know as a fact that there are a great many American schooners and ships and barks, besides the American steamers, that will carry this coal under the American

flag as cheaply, if not more so, than any foreign vessel; and that a great many American vessels to-day are lying idle in Puget Sound, and the gentleman from Washington [Mr. HUMPHREY] I know will bear me out when I say these ships are riding at anchor simply because they can not get goods to carry to the Philippines and foreign ports. Let us begin to put the American flag on our merchant vessels; let us protect in every way American ships against foreign ships; let us send our coal and our goods and our merchandise to the Philippine Islands and to the Orient in American ships, under the American flag, and manned by American sailors. [Applause.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, the trouble with my colleague is that he is not acquainted with the facts. Coal is not shipped to the Philippine Islands from the Pacific coast, and if the entire coast were piled high with idle American ships they could not be utilized for this purpose.

Mr. SULZER. I would like to ask the gentleman if he has ever been on the Pacific coast?

Mr. FITZGERALD. No.

Mr. SULZER. Then he ought not to say that I do not know the facts. I have been there several times. The President sent a message—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Oh, Mr. Chairman, I decline to yield to my colleague to make my speech. I shall make this one myself. The coal that the Navy Department ships to the Philippine Islands is shipped from the Atlantic seaboard. Ships that are on the Pacific coast are not available for that purpose. The evidence is that a few men, some of them, I regret to say, living in the district which I represent, own a few American ships that have been engaged in this traffic, and they have been extorting unreasonable prices from the American Government for the transportation of coal from the Atlantic seaboard to the Philippine Islands.

If my colleague favors the continuation of that practice, I do not, and I doubt whether any other Democrat who understands the facts favors a continuation of the policy. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN] has offered an amendment that limits the use of this appropriation for the purchase of coal in the Philippine Islands. It requires American coal to be purchased there under certain circumstances. The fact is that the Department has received bids under which, if it could accept bids from those who are willing to transport in other than American bottoms, it could get coal delivered in the Philippine Islands at something like \$2 a ton less than can be purchased from those who are shipping in American bottoms. The law of April 28, 1904, provides that American bottoms shall be used to carry supplies and coal for the Navy unless the President shall find that the rates of freight charged by said vessels are excessive and unreasonable, and it also provides that no greater charge shall be made by such vessels for the transportation of articles for the use of the Army and Navy than are made by such vessels for the transportation of like goods for private parties or companies.

So far as I can ascertain, these vessels do not transport any goods for private parties, so that that part of the law is not effective. The Secretary of the Navy in his report last year said that the only effect of this law was to benefit a few shipowners, without helping to build a single American ship or to train a single American seaman. He asked then that it be repealed; he asks now that it be repealed. One hundred and ninety-three thousand dollars has been paid to a few men owning a few American ships in excess of the amount for which the work would have been done if this law had not been enacted. I desire to see the seas covered with American ships, but I am unwilling to have it done at the expense of the American people. If my colleague favors the payment of subsidies, I am quite sure that he is not in sympathy with the great mass of his Democratic colleagues. [Applause on the Democratic side.] That is not Democratic doctrine; it never has been, and, so far as we are informed, it never will be [applause on the Democratic side]; and when he favors paying subsidies he will have to leave his Democratic colleagues and join those against whom we have been aligned ever since the establishment of the Democratic party. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The CHAIRMAN. Debate upon the pending amendment is exhausted.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, just a word.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent—for how much time?

Mr. SULZER. For a few minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, in the first place, I desire to say to my colleague that I have been the most consistent oppo-

nent on the floor of this House for the past ten years to what is known as "ship subsidies," and I have been in favor of and I have had a bill pending in this House for ten years, which is a comprehensive measure and defines my position, and it will be printed, with ample data, in the RECORD to-morrow morning.

I am in favor of building up the merchant marine of the United States by a system of tonnage taxes in favor of the American-built ships carrying the American flag, and make the foreign shipowner pay the tax. I believe that we never can pass a free-ship bill.

I believe it is impossible to pass a ship-subsidy bill, and I know how difficult it is to carry out the policy recommended by President McKinley, and for a while advocated by the Republican party, to build up our merchant marine by discriminating duties.

Now, the bill I have advocated from the beginning is a tonnage-tax bill, so that foreign ships will have to pay a tax upon their tonnage. That was the policy of Jefferson, that was the policy of the fathers of the country, and that ought to be the policy to-day of every patriotic American citizen.

There ought to be no politics in this merchant-marine question whatever. It is a business matter and a patriotic matter, and I am in favor of doing everything in my power along legitimate and constitutional lines to aid American ships and build up a great merchant marine.

I stand to-day just where I always have stood, and say that I believe it is a good thing to give such aid as we can consistently to build American ships on the Pacific coast; give them a little advantage at first, if necessary, in order to start the shipyards working out there and give employment to thousands of workmen and send the coal to the Philippines in American bottoms. There is no subsidy in this matter. The gentleman has never been on the Pacific coast, but the message of the President to-day, which was read in this House this morning, tells the story. There is more coal in the State of Washington than there is in Pennsylvania. There is more coal in Alaska than in all the United States—and the very best kind of coal—bituminous, anthracite, and lignite; great veins of coal are there, and the President is trying to save these coal lands for all the people.

Now, we do not want to transport coal from the Atlantic seaboard around Cape Horn in ships owned by the shipping trust. Of course that will cost more on account of the distance. We want to transport this coal across the Pacific from Seattle and Tacoma and Alaskan ports—

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I only have a few minutes, and I trust the gentleman will not interrupt me.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I am informed that every ship on the Atlantic coast is under the control of the shipping trust, and that is the reason they charge these exorbitant prices; but that would not be so, in my judgment, with American steamers and sailing vessels on the Pacific coast—

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. Will the gentleman permit an interruption there?

Mr. SULZER. In a moment. These ships from Puget Sound can transport this coal from the State of Washington and Alaska to the Philippine Islands for less cost than ships can from any other port in the world, because from Seattle, in the State of Washington, and from Alaska we are from 600 to 1,000 miles nearer the Orient—nearer the Philippine Islands—than we are from San Francisco, to say nothing about ports on the Atlantic Ocean and the long journey around Cape Horn and then across the Pacific Ocean.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. Will the gentleman permit an interruption now?

Mr. SULZER. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. I understood the gentleman to say all the ships on the Atlantic coast are controlled by the shipping trust.

Mr. SULZER. Yes; I am informed most of them are, at all events.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. Is not the gentleman aware that the American steamers transporting coal are steamers from the eastern coast, and leave from the Chesapeake Bay to go to the Philippines and—

Mr. SULZER. I want them to go from Puget Sound—that is the place to get the coal—and it will cost less there and can be shipped cheaper from there—

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. And every dollar of this has been paid to the very class of ships you think are in the trust.

Mr. SULZER. That is what I am opposed to—foreign-built ships, carrying the foreign flag, doing our business. I want to carry American goods, wares, and merchandise in American ships, built in American shipyards, carrying the American flag,

do our business and help develop our great resources on the Pacific and revive our languishing shipping industry. These ships on the Pacific are not in the trust—

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. The coal does not start from the Pacific coast.

Mr. SULZER. Of course it does not, but that is where it ought to start from. That is the point I am trying to make. We have coal there for all the world.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. Then, it will cost much more at this time.

Mr. SULZER. No; in my opinion, not half as much. I agree substantially with the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED] in regard to this proposition.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. The fact is that they furnish coal to the Puget Sound Navy-Yard, in the State of Washington.

Mr. SULZER. That is true. There is no doubt—

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. And they do not charge an exorbitant price for it, either.

Mr. SULZER. I believe it to be the fact that the Pacific coast furnishes coal to the navy-yard at Puget Sound, to the revenue cutters, and charges the Government much less for that coal than it can be purchased at Atlantic ports; and I know the great smelters out on the Pacific coast get all the coal they want for much less a ton than they could buy it here.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. GILBERT. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to address the committee.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I object.

Mr. GILBERT. I ask unanimous consent to address the committee for three minutes.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me we ought to have the decision of the Chair upon the point of order first.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to decide. The provision presented here is clearly a limitation, and the amendment offered to that limitation by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED] is in order. The proposition submitted by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GILBERT] as a substitute is not properly a substitute, as the Chair understands it, under the proper interpretation of the rule. It really is an amendment in the third degree, which the rules expressly prohibit. Therefore the Chair can not recognize it as a substitute. The question, then, is upon the amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED].

Mr. FITZGERALD. Did the Chair dispose of the first amendment?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overruled the point of order.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word of the amendment and ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I do not wish to object to this request. It is now half past 1 o'clock, and we have not proceeded a particle with this, and if there is any more discussion on this I will object.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. GILBERT] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, I am in hearty sympathy with the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED], and the substitute that I presented a while ago was not captious, but was substantial, and it ought to be embodied in that amendment. The amendment that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has in mind is for the support of American bottoms. We want to encourage the shipment of coal in that way. But the gentleman from Pennsylvania has not defined what American bottoms are. The law books teach that a merchant vessel is the property of its owner, subject to the laws of the locality where it may be placed, subject to the laws and institutions of the ports wherever it may be; and to state that coal shall be shipped in American bottoms means nothing unless he gives an additional amendment or explanation as to what constitutes American bottoms.

A ship that is owned by an American corporation and built by American money and operated under the British flag is just as much an American bottom as if it floated from the masthead the American flag. Therefore, we will be left in confusion as to what constitutes an American bottom, and we ought to define it either in this amendment or elsewhere as being the ships that are really the property of American citizens without regard to the flag that floats from the masthead.

A word as to the proposition of the main amendment, offered by the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN]. We

Democrats for time out of mind, in season and out of season, have antagonized everything in the way of a subsidy. We have stood here for years and clamored for the free admission of ships purchased in foreign ports. Now, the gentleman insists that we shall force American citizens and people who live in the Philippine Islands to buy coal simply because it has been shipped to the islands in American bottoms under the American flag, and forcing the poor inhabitants of the Philippine Islands to pay \$2 or \$3 more per ton for their coal solely because of the fact that it has been shipped in American bottoms. And that is throwing to the winds all of our argument against ship subsidies, because it is, in fact, a subsidy.

Why not stand by the doctrine that we have always advocated, and allow American capitalists to go to any foreign shipyard, upon the Clyde or Mersey, or anywhere else, and buy their ships where they can buy them the cheapest and bring them home and float the American flag on them? This is the only country in the civilized world that retains upon its statute books that superannuated old law that we can not float the national flag from a ship except the ship has been built in American shipyards.

Now, his proposition is second cousin to that—that is, we shall force the American people who reside in the Philippine Islands and American subjects in the Philippine Islands to buy coal because it has been brought from America and carried there in American ships, even if they are required to pay a higher price.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. On the contrary, my proposition is exactly the reverse.

Mr. GILBERT. The gentleman from New York, then, has misrepresented your amendment in his statement.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. The gentleman ought to argue my amendment from the amendment itself, and not from an argument made on it.

Mr. GILBERT. I heard it read, and, like the gentleman from Pennsylvania, misunderstood it if it did not contain that proposition; but I would like the gentleman from Pennsylvania to define in his amendment what he means by American bottoms.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this amendment and the paragraph be closed.

The question was taken; and the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania to the amendment of the gentleman from California.

The question was taken; and the amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. Now, Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment to the amendment as it now stands.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add to the amendment the words:

Provided, That in the expenditure of this appropriation any rates of freight charged by owners of vessels of the United States for the transportation of coal to the Philippine Islands which are greater than 25 per cent in excess over and above bona fide rates offered by responsible owners of other vessels shall be deemed excessive and unreasonable, and in such case the Navy Department may employ such other vessels for such transportation.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that is a change of the discretion that is now lodged in the Secretary of the Navy.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. The last two lines ought to be stricken out. I thought I had stricken out the last two lines from that sheet.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Offer a new one, or I will object to unanimous consent to its going out.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. Now, Mr. Chairman, I offer it with the last two lines omitted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment now offered.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the amendment:

Provided, That in the expenditure of this appropriation any rates of freight charged by owners of vessels of the United States for the transportation of coal to the Philippine Islands which are greater than 25 per cent excess over and above bona fide rates offered by responsible owners of other vessels shall be deemed excessive and unreasonable."

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. I made the point of order against that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. Now, on that point of order, just one moment.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. It is very clear to the Chair.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. It seems to me it is germane to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

The CHAIRMAN. It is more than a limitation, and it is not germane. The Chair sustains the point of order. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina as amended by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, which has just been adopted.

The question was taken; and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Navy-yard, Boston, Mass.: For one superintendent of ropewalk, at \$2,000; one clerk, at \$1,400; one clerk, at \$1,300; one clerk, at \$1,200; 2 writers, at \$950 each; one civil superintendent of chain shop, \$2,000; one civil superintendent of anchor shop, \$2,000; in all, \$11,800.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, in line 2, page 21, by striking out the word "rope" and inserting "cake" in lieu thereof.

Mr. FOSS. I make the point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I reserve the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. OLMSTED. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment for the purpose of getting some information on this subject. This is, so far as I know—

Mr. MANN. What does the gentleman want information about? The cake walk?

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Chairman, we had last year evidence in abundance before this committee to show that at this navy-yard at Boston, in these works where this ropewalk is, the Government makes chains for the Navy at a cost very largely exceeding the price at which chains can be obtained from private manufacturers, of as good quality and often better quality.

Now, this paragraph as it now stands seems to me to show one reason why it costs the Government so much more to make chains in that navy-yard. We have here for one superintendent of ropewalk, \$2,000. I should like to know what that ropewalk is that requires a \$2,000 superintendent. Then he has a clerk at \$1,400, another at \$1,300, and another at \$1,200, and two writers, whatever they are, at \$950 each. Then we have a civil superintendent of the chain shop at \$2,000 and a civil superintendent of the anchor shop at \$2,000; in all, \$11,800 carried by the paragraph. No wonder the chain is costing so much, if it costs \$2,000 for a superintendent of the ropewalk and \$11,800 in all for superintendence of this little factory. The amendment which I offered in the first place, to substitute "cake" for "rope," was, of course, subject to the point of order; but it seems to me to be just as necessary to appropriate \$2,000 to a superintendent of cakewalk as it is to vote that sum for mere superintendence of this ropewalk, the necessity for which nobody seems able to explain. In anything but a Government factory one \$1,500 man would do all the superintending for which we are asked to provide three at \$2,000 each.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to state to the gentleman that we have inserted on page 38 a provision in this bill authorizing the Secretary of the Navy to make an investigation into the cost of articles and materials manufactured by the Government at navy-yards and naval stations, and the cost of like articles and materials purchased in the open market, so we will have the result of the investigation before the committee.

Mr. OLMSTED. Perhaps, if the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] does not make a point of order against the provision.

Mr. MANN. I am informed that there will be a point of order made against the provision of the bill.

Mr. FOSS. Does the gentleman from Pennsylvania insist on striking out this paragraph?

Mr. OLMSTED. I do, unless the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs will give us some light on the subject as to why the appropriations are needed.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED] to strike out the paragraph.

The question was taken; and there were—ayes 4, noes 27.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the item "one superintendent of ropewalk, \$2,000."

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I call for a vote.

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Navy-yard, Mare Island, Cal.: For one clerk, at \$1,200; one clerk, at \$1,000; one writer, at \$950; in all, \$3,150.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word; and I should like to inquire, with reference to the top of page 21, what kind of ropes are manufactured at this ropewalk—manila or wire?

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs has gone out to get something to eat, and I will ask the gentleman from Maine to please restrain himself until the chairman returns. I do not know anything about the ropewalk.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. The chairman of the committee having gone in search of food, the gentleman from Pennsylvania can furnish us with very little food on this point.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. I am sorry to say that I can not.

Mr. ROBERTS. I will say to the gentleman from Maine that at this ropewalk they make both wire and hemp rope.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Cable?

Mr. ROBERTS. They make cable; yes.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Is it confined to cables?

Mr. ROBERTS. No; they make different sizes of rope, such as they use in the Navy; largely cables, however.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. This item has been in the bill for ten years.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. While that may be true, the gentleman from Pennsylvania will concede that that fact does not shed any light on the subject.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. That may be true.

Mr. ROBERTS. I will say, for the information of the gentleman from Maine, that all of the rope, both manila and wire, used in the Navy, is made in this establishment, except that in cases of great emergency they buy small quantities outside.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. So that it covers the whole Department?

Mr. ROBERTS. Covers the whole Department.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. While we are on this subject, I will inquire if the gentleman from Massachusetts can inform the committee whether or not it costs the Government as much or more to manufacture its rope under these circumstances than it would to purchase from private individuals—what the fact is in that respect?

Mr. ROBERTS. I will say that matter was gone into very fully on the floor last year when the bill was under consideration, and it was maintained by certain Members that it cost the Government more to manufacture these articles in the navy-yard than it would to purchase them outside, but it was contended, on the other hand, that the articles manufactured by the Government in the yard were of superior quality to anything that could be purchased outside.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Is this the proposition that was fought a year ago by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LOUD]?

Mr. ROBERTS. Yes; part of it.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. I understand the gentleman from Massachusetts to say that it is the contention of the Department that they can not get as high a quality by purchase outside as is manufactured here.

Mr. ROBERTS. That is true; and I will say for the further information of the gentleman from Maine that I have been informed personally by officers of the revenue service that they buy their cables, hemp and manila, from the Government, because those cables made in the Charlestown yard are of a better quality than they can get anywhere in the open market.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. So that this ropewalk practically has a monopoly of the quality that is needed for use in the Navy?

Mr. ROBERTS. The Navy standard is higher than the commercial standard.

Mr. LOUD. The gentleman from Massachusetts has stated, as he did last year, that the rope manufactured by the Government was better than the highest grade you can buy in the market. We did not concede that argument then and we do not concede it now.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. What is the fact about the cost?

Mr. LOUD. The cost was very much larger for that manufactured by the Government.

Mr. McNARY. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that even though the gentleman from Michigan does not admit the fact, it was clearly shown on the floor last year by the reports of the Navy Department that the chains manufactured by the private manufacturers did not come up to the test and could not pass the test given by the Navy Department officials.

Mr. ROBERTS. Will the gentleman from Maine yield?

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTS. I want to say in addition to that that it was in evidence before the committee and on this floor that when the Department went outside to get chain cable manufactured they had to lower the standard before they could get bids from outside manufacturers. That appeared in evidence. They had to reduce the specifications as to strength and quality which they required in the chain made by the Government.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. That is, its tensile strength?

Mr. ROBERTS. It was in evidence before the Department—I think it was not produced here—that when they did lower the standard and succeeded in getting outside manufacturers to bid, those manufacturers said they had to go to the chain shop in Charlestown yard to get men who knew how to make the chains.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. To get the mechanics?

Mr. ROBERTS. To get the mechanics, and they had to send parts of the chain into the yard to be made, because they didn't have the machinery or the men or the experience to make certain parts of the chain, like the shackles—I do not know what the names of the particular parts were.

Mr. PAYNE. If the gentleman from Maine will allow me, I would like to ask a question of the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. Certainly.

Mr. PAYNE. I want to ask the gentleman from Massachusetts if they still use in this navy-yard the old-fashioned method of making cables—that is, with a walk attached to the machinery—or do they use the new and later and more improved machinery where they dispense with the walk?

Mr. ROBERTS. The walk is used in order to get the length of cable.

Mr. PAYNE. That was the old theory, but the up-to-date theory and method is that they do not use it; they use the machine.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I understood the gentleman from Maine asked permission to make an inquiry and unanimous consent was given him.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman from Maine to move to strike out the last word and to take the floor, and under that amendment the time has expired. The Chair will now recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED].

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. I will ask the gentleman to permit two lines of the bill to be read in the absence of the chairman, so that I can be able to report that fact to him. [Laughter.]

Mr. OLMSTED. Mr. Chairman, I should very much like to further the laudable ambition of my friend and colleague, but I wish to say just a word on this subject in answer to what has been said by the gentleman from Massachusetts. With all respect for him I beg to suggest that the evidence to which he refers was not presented on the floor a year ago. On the contrary, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LOUD] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] both read conclusive evidence showing that the chains manufactured at Lebanon, Pa., were vastly superior to the chains made by the Government; that numerous breakages in the Government chains were shown by the officers of different vessels from whose reports the gentlemen read. I desire to state that it is not a fact that in the manufacture of chains at private factories, certainly not in the Lebanon factory, has it ever been necessary to go to Charlestown. On the contrary, they have at Lebanon better workmen, better machinery, better methods, make a better chain, and sell it to the Government at a lower price than the Government can make it at the Charlestown yard or anywhere else.

Mr. ROBERTS was recognized.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will it be in order to move to close debate?

The CHAIRMAN. Not until the gentleman from Pennsylvania has the floor. The gentleman from Massachusetts now has the floor.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts allow me to ask him a question before he proceeds?

Mr. ROBERTS. Certainly.

Mr. GROSVENOR. The gentleman can answer it as he goes along. Will he state what authority he has for saying that the Government has lowered at any time its standard in the purchase of chains from outside sources? That is the first question. This is the second: From whom did they buy the chains and what was the result? Third, will the gentleman kindly state if it is not true that the log of the steamer *Maine* showed five partings of her cables in one voyage, and whether or not those cables were made at the Charleston Navy-Yard?

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, the source of information as to the lowering of the standards came from the Bureau of Equipment at the Navy Department.

Mr. GROSVENOR. When?

Mr. ROBERTS. It was before our committee, I think, in a statement at the hearings, but I am not sure about that. That is where it came from, however.

Mr. GROSVENOR. I am told by a member of the committee that no such information ever reached the committee.

Mr. ROBERTS. Will the gentleman kindly repeat that second question he put?

Mr. GROSVENOR. From whom did they buy the cable under the lowered standard?

Mr. ROBERTS. I am not able to tell the gentleman from memory. I have in my room the evidence that I have been mentioning here, and can easily ascertain it if the gentleman desires. I want to say this in regard to the cable breaking on the *Maine*. It is a fact that the cable has been broken on that and other ships repeatedly, but that is no indication that the ship did not have the best possible cable that can be made.

Any naval man will tell you that if you bring strain enough on the cable when the anchor is fast in the mud or among the rocks, you can break any cable that could possibly be made. Furthermore, if there is a kink in that cable when the anchor is dropped, if it brings up with a jerk, it will break the best cable made. There was a great deal said last year about the weakness of the Government-made cables, because some of them had broken under service conditions. Nothing was said about the hundreds, and I might say thousands, of merchant ships that have parted their cables, commercial cables, not made in the Government plants, while they were lying at anchor, and have become a total loss. I challenged the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR] last year, and I challenge him again, to point to an instance of a naval vessel riding at anchor upon a naval cable, that has ever had that cable parted under the severest stress of weather, and on the other hand you can point to hundreds of thousands of cases of commercial ships that have parted their cables while trying to ride out storms, and the vessels have become a total loss, the cable of the Government being made in the Government yard and the cable of the commercial ship being a commercially made cable, bought in the open market. That should be the test of the strength of the cable. What they do under service conditions is the test. The gentleman says nothing about the hundreds and thousands of breaks of commercial cable under the same circumstances exactly to which he alludes in the case of the *Maine*.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. OLMSTED] says there was no testimony here last year along the lines indicated by me. He misunderstood me if I made the absolute statement that there was such testimony. As a matter of fact the proposition came before the committee last year entirely without notice to anybody on the Naval Committee. It was sprung upon the House here, and those who were opposed to the appropriation had no means of getting this information together until the debate had closed. I want to say to this committee and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR], and to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. LOUD], that the next day the former chief of the Bureau of Equipment, after debate had closed and all opportunity to get the evidence before this committee had passed, came to my house with letters that had been written by manufacturers of cable, or those who proposed to manufacture cable for the Government, setting out the very things I referred to a while ago. I want to state further in regard to the case of this cable. I am advised by the head of the Department that a machine has been invented for bending the links of this heaviest cable. That machine has been installed in the Charlestown yard, and it is materially decreasing the cost of the cable to the Government. That is a fact that should be taken into consideration, and for the benefit of the gentleman from Maine [Mr. LITTLEFIELD], who made some inquiry about relative cost, and to the committee, I would say that the Naval Committee this year has put a provision in the bill, which, if it escapes a point of order, will bring to this Congress at the next session the cost of all articles made in the Government yards; cables, chains, ropes, uniforms, everything that the Government manufactures in the yards, and a comparison with the cost of that same article made in the open market.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Mr. Chairman, I do not pretend to be skilled in this manufacture of cables. I took a little interest in this discussion in the last session of this Congress because of the information that was brought to me that the cost of the construction of cables in the navy-yards of the country had increased the aggregate appropriations and expenditures to an extravagant and unnecessary point. There was nothing in the testimony in regard to the parting of the cables upon the ship *Maine* that justifies the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROBERTS] in saying that she parted her cables in the midst of a storm. It was a simple report of a voyage of the *Maine*, and it was a statement of the parting of her cables five times.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question right on that point?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Yes.

Mr. ROBERTS. Did not that testimony show that the cable

parted while the anchor in each instance was being raised or lowered?

Mr. GROSVENOR. Not at all.

Mr. ROBERTS. I have seen it, and if I am not mistaken that is the testimony. It is the fact, at any rate.

Mr. GROSVENOR. Here is the letter, and I will satisfy myself. This is a letter addressed to Hon. GEORGE A. LOUD, of Michigan, by N. A. Niles, captain, United States Navy, commanding U. S. S. *Maine*:

U. S. S. *MAINE*,
North River, New York, N. Y., May 9, 1906.

Sir: In reference to your letter of May 3, 1906, to the Chief of Bureau of Navigation, asking for an excerpt from the log of this ship covering the subject of losing anchors, I have the honor to state that the records of the ship show that the following-mentioned cases of chain or triplet links—

Which is the very thing it is claimed can not be made anywhere else than in Boston—

parting had occurred prior to my taking command:

(a) In letting go the anchor on March 23, 1904, on the target range at Pensacola, Fla., one link of the "triplet" broke, and the anchor was recovered.

(b) While heaving in the starboard bower chain on July 8, 1904, at anchor off Corfu, Greece, it parted, and the anchor and 25 fathoms of chain were afterwards recovered. This was due to a defective link at about 26 fathoms.

(c) While heaving in at Marthas Vineyard on September 9, 1904, the chain came in without the anchor. The examination showed that the middle link of the bending shackle triplet had broken across the weld. This anchor was lost and no trace of its buoy could be found.

(d) While heaving in off Cape Henry, Virginia, on June 1, 1905, it was found that the second link of the port triplet had parted. The anchor was recovered.

2. Since I have taken command of the *Maine* the following-mentioned cases have occurred:

(e) In letting go the port anchor on the target range off Barnstable, Mass., on September 22, 1905, the chain parted at the outboard link of the triplet. The anchor was recovered.

(f) In letting go the port anchor in North River on May 4, 1906, the middle link of the triplet parted almost immediately after letting go and before the anchor had touched the bottom. The anchor has been recovered.

3. The anchor chain of this ship was manufactured at the Boston Navy-Yard.

Very respectfully,

N. A. NILES,
Captain, U. S. Navy, Commanding.

Hon. GEORGE A. LOUD, M. C.,
Tenth District, Michigan,
Committee on Naval Affairs, Washington, D. C.

That is the evidence that was presented, Mr. Chairman. Now, I have no interest one way or the other in this. My idea is and I feel like scoffing at the suggestion that a great article, the coarse but wonderfully strong article of chains can not be manufactured in the United States except through some occult skill in some navy-yard somewhere. Why, Mr. Chairman, there is no nation on earth that does not equip more or less of their great ships from the handiwork of American genius, and can it be said that the American people, with their tremendous and enormous development of efficiency in all kinds of iron and steel manufacture, can not make a chain? I have no other interest in the matter than that.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FOSS. Do I understand debate has closed?

The CHAIRMAN. Debate has not been closed.

Mr. FOSS. Well, I move to close debate—

Mr. McNARY. I desire a moment or two to reply to the statement made by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, which ought to be answered, that we had not presented the evidence last year in regard to the Lebanon works; and I have the evidence right here—

Mr. FOSS. Now, Mr. Chairman, debate on a proposition of this kind comes more properly later in the bill.

Mr. McNARY. Let me say to you this is the time debate has originated, and it ought to be met now. I do not desire more than four or five minutes.

Mr. FOSS. Then, Mr. Chairman, I move to close debate on this in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois moves that debate on this paragraph be closed in five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. Chairman, in view of the statement that we had not presented on the floor last session evidence of the inferiority of the chains, ropes, etc., of private manufacturers as compared with that of the Boston yard, I want to call the attention of the Members to page 6591 of the Record of last session, in which I personally on the floor presented the evidence of Admiral Manney before the Committee on Naval Affairs, and I want to call the attention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania to some things which he said in that evidence.

Mr. ROBERTS asked the Admiral if he could not get any end-weld chains made outside, and Admiral Manney replied:

"Not on the larger chains. There are other points about the chain cables. The Boston chain, as I said, is of the highest grade iron; it is better iron than is put in commercial chains. Much of the latter is

unsuitable. Such chains are unduly heavy and liable to accident. The cables of the Pacific liners of which I spoke are, I believe, the largest ever made in this country—3½ inches; cost, \$0.543 per pound. There is no machine in the United States that can test that cable for strength if it is the best cable iron. It is safe to say that it has never been tested. These chains would not meet the Navy Department specifications. The increase of weight above that of the largest navy cable is for two cables 34,000 pounds (17 tons), which would have to be paid for at whatever the price per pound might be. Such weight is objectionable in a battle ship, because, as she carries from three to four cables, the unnecessary weight would bar out from 25½ to 34 tons of armor, ammunition, or coal. Two cables, the least number a merchant ship would carry, would have an unnecessary weight of 34,000 pounds, which would have to be paid for at the rate of 5½ cents per pound at least. High grade chain of a smaller size costs even more per pound than the larger cable. The latest contract made by the Bureau for 2½ inch chain is with a Pittsburg firm for 8½ cents; 2½-inch chain at Boston costs between 9 and 10 cents.

"Mr. ROBERTS. Are you familiar with the size and quality of the chain that Mr. LOUD says is sold in the markets at 4 cents?

"Admiral MANNEY. I do not know of first-class chain cables of first-class iron at such a price. The Lawson's cables and those of Hill's Pacific Line are more than 3 inches in diameter, larger than the Navy chain cables. I am sure they cost more than 4 cents a pound. The *Minnesota's*, of that line, cost 5.43 cents per pound. I believe the statement that 'the very best chain that can be bought in this country for use in the highest class ships is for about 4 cents per pound,' is in error."

And further:

"Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Now, you say that the contract work is not as good as that done in the yard?

"Admiral MANNEY. Contract work that we have had done from the Lebanon Chain Works has shown up upon test to have the strength necessary to pass it. The method of welding the links is inferior to that employed at the yard. The yard uses the end weld; in the large commercial chains purchased the side weld is employed. This is objectionable, as the two sides of the link are then not symmetrical in strength. The part of the link which has been oftenest heated and pounded has not the same texture as the other part.

"Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Does your test show inferiority in the manufacture of chains?

"Admiral MANNEY. The breaks show where the weakest part is, and the links having the end weld have been found the stronger.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Will they not weld them at the end if you demand it?

"Admiral MANNEY. No; they state that they can not. It would increase the cost."

And further on the same page he replied as follows to Mr. LOUD:

"Mr. LOUD. I find in the last report that when they were short last year they went outside and bought large chains. They can be bought outside?

"Admiral MANNEY. Those chains were made by contract. They were 2½-inch cables. The method of making was inferior to the Government method, because a side weld was employed. The contractors would not undertake to make an end weld, and never have made an end weld; specifications had to be waived on the manufacture and material.

"Mr. RIXEY. I understood you to say in the first part of your hearing that these chains were made at the Boston yard by the Government cheaper than outside.

"Admiral MANNEY. Cheaper, in one sense, than can be bought outside and better finished—more durable. The 2½-inch cables made in Boston cost 9½ cents per pound; the same sized cable made by contract costs 9½ cents per pound."

Further on he says:

"Admiral MANNEY. We make all kinds of rope—wire, hemp, and manila. Our rope we consider better than outside rope. We know what it is. Quality considered, it is cheaper.

"Mr. RIXEY. You say now that you can make rope cheaper than outside?

"Admiral MANNEY. Of the same quality; yes.

"Mr. RIXEY. Why is it that you can make rope cheaper than outside, but can not make the chains?

"Admiral MANNEY. We buy material in each case. The rope is machine made; the chain cables are made by hand. They are especially heavy, difficult, and expensive to handle. Handmade articles are more expensive than similar ones made by machinery. The best chain iron in the market is bought to make cables. It is expensive, not only because of quality, but because of high cost of transportation. As to ropes, only the very highest grade of hemp and manila is bought by the Navy, and it is carefully inspected. Much of the manila and hemp that is sold in the market is not of the first quality, and especially is that the case with manila. The grade of manila used in the Boston-made rope is not put in commercial rope nor quoted unless 'special grade' is asked for."

I submit that the Record shows that we presented this evidence on the floor last session, and as a result of presenting that and other evidence on the same line we beat the proposition which was made to do away with the making of chain cable, anchors, and rope in the Boston yard. It was fairly beaten on the floor by the weight of evidence and argument during the last session of Congress.

Mr. ROBERTS. I want to say just a word or two in reply to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GROSVENOR]. The letter written by Captain Niles, if that is his name, which the gentleman read, sustains the contention which I made, that in every instance when the cable on a naval vessel had been broken it was either in hoisting or in lowering the anchor. I made no statement that the *Maine* parted cables while riding at anchor. My statement was that in all instances when a naval vessel parted a cable it was done when hoisting the anchor or lowering it.

Now, just one word further. No claim has been made either by the Navy Department or by any Member of this House that the Charleston Navy-Yard makes an absolutely perfect cable. Perfection in a cable is impossible. You can not make a cable

of sufficient size and strength to stand the strains that will be brought upon it. The contention that is made by the Navy Department and by the gentlemen from Massachusetts [Messrs. ROBERTS and McNARY] is that the Navy Department makes the finest chain that is made in the country or in the world.

The CHAIRMAN. The time for debate on this paragraph has closed, and without objection the pro forma amendment will be withdrawn and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Navy-yard, Charleston, S. C.: Commandant's office: One stenographer and typewriter, at \$3.04 per diem; one writer and telegraph operator, at \$2 per diem, including Sundays; one mail messenger, at \$2 per diem, including Sundays; one messenger and janitor, at \$1.52 per diem, including Sundays. Civil engineer's office: One clerk, at \$1,300; one stenographer, at \$2.80 per diem; one messenger, at \$1.52 per diem; in all, \$5,631.36.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order upon the paragraph, lines 15 to 25, on page 30. I would like to ask the chairman what is the reason for this item at this time?

Mr. FOSS. We have been building during the last two or three years a navy-yard at Charleston, and this is the first time that we have put in the civil establishment.

Mr. MANN. This is to take the place of Port Royal, and so forth?

Mr. FOSS. To take the place of Port Royal, and the men who were at Port Royal have been transferred to this station here.

Mr. MANN. So that there is no appropriation proposed for Port Royal this year?

Mr. FOSS. No appropriation, except simply for a watchman, I believe.

Mr. MANN. I mean for the civil establishment?

Mr. FOSS. No.

Mr. MANN. This is practically a transfer?

Mr. FOSS. Yes; practically a transfer.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of the Navy is hereby authorized to appoint a board of five persons, not more than two of whom shall be naval officers, which board shall investigate and report not later than December 1, 1907, as to all matters of construction, management, and administration of the navy-yards and stations, with a view to placing the same on a more economical basis, and to defray the compensation and expense of said board the sum of \$15,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary, is hereby appropriated.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that provision.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I desire to make the point of order against that provision.

Mr. FOSS. I hope the gentleman will not make the point of order against that provision, because I believe it is a very important one. It provides for a board to visit the naval yards and stations with the view of putting them on a more economical and businesslike basis. It is on the line of economy.

Mr. MANN. I would like to ask my colleague whether, in his judgment, it would require a larger appropriation?

Mr. FOSS. A larger appropriation than \$15,000?

Mr. MANN. When the board reports, and we put the places on a more economical basis, it would require more money to carry out the report. Has the gentleman ever known of a report of a board of this kind that did not propose to expend an additional sum of money over that current expense?

Mr. FOSS. As the gentleman perhaps knows, at the present time we have a bureau system in our yards and stations, and this investigation would have as one of its purposes to look into that question and see whether or not that present system would be as economical as, for instance, that of the consolidation of some of the bureaus in the navy-yards.

Mr. MANN. Well, is not that something that the Secretary of the Navy can do now without getting an outsider to go in there at all?

Mr. FOSS. This provides that two members of the board shall be naval officers. While the Secretary of the Navy has perfect authority to investigate a matter of this kind, yet he can not appoint a board of two naval officers and the rest civilians.

Mr. MANN. I understand.

Mr. FOSS. The committee is of the opinion that whatever reform comes in the management of these naval yards must come really from outside—from expert engineers or the superintendent of large shipbuilding plants. But he can not appoint such a board as is here authorized.

Mr. MANN. And, of course, their report, to be more economical, would require a different plant, an additional plant, and greater expense in connection with the operation of that plant; like all other boards, in order to be more economical, it would require more money.

Mr. FOSS. I can hardly agree with my colleague in that

proposition. But if the gentleman wishes to make the point of order, I hope he will make it, and have no further time consumed in debate.

Mr. PERKINS. I shall make the point of order, but I wish to take the liberty, as the gentleman has spoken on the matter, to question the propriety of any such way of making the investigation.

Mr. FOSS. All right.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I have no desire to make captious points of order. If I thought this proposition was a wise one I certainly should not object to it on the floor. But we have, Mr. Chairman, this experience in this House that commissions of this sort are always productive of expense but rarely productive of valuable results. Now, we have a Navy, the expense of which is almost \$100,000,000 a year. We have numerous officers of high rank, and certainly I am unwilling to believe that in the Navy of the United States there can not be found persons who are competent to pass upon this question.

In this very bill, on page 38, there is another Commission, whereby investigation is to be made in reference to the cost of articles manufactured by the Government. That is as they should be—an investigation made without expense to the Government by the officers of the Government. If the investigation which the gentleman asks was framed in the same manner as that on page 38 I should not raise the point of order. But now an investigation is directed to be made by outside officers at an expense of \$15,000. I do not believe that with the great Navy we have, with the eminent officers connected with it, it is necessary for us to go outside to be informed as to the manner in which our navy-yards are to be erected and carried on. Therefore I must insist upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. FOSS. Just one moment. A few years ago the Secretary of the Navy was authorized to make an investigation. A board was appointed of civilian experts, and the result was that the board reported in favor of the consolidation of the light, heat, and power plants, and that is going on now in the navy-yards. The result, as we believe, will be to get a more economical administration of the yards.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him a question?

Mr. FOSS. Certainly.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Did not the Secretary of the Navy last year in his annual report recommend a readjustment of the administrative service and consolidation of several bureaus?

Mr. FOSS. I think he did.

Mr. PAYNE. I would like to ask the gentleman in that connection, and I rose for that purpose, if the Secretary of the Navy has not authority now, under the law, to make this examination and report to Congress?

Mr. FOSS. I think he has perfect authority, but he does not do it, and for that reason we would like to insert this provision.

Mr. PAYNE. It seems to me that the gentleman should introduce a simple resolution of inquiry of the Secretary of the Navy, have it referred to his committee, and report it; and without expense the Secretary of the Navy could report on this matter.

Mr. FOSS. I understand the gentleman insists upon his point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order has been sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Navy-yard, Portsmouth, N. H.: Railroad and rolling stock, \$2,000; sewer system, extension, \$2,000; quay walls, to extend, \$20,000; grading, to continue, \$15,000; central power plant, to complete, \$60,000; blasting in front of quay wall (to cost \$110,000), \$50,000; coaling plant, \$15,000; naval prison laundry, \$3,000; naval prison cooking and baking plant, \$3,200; naval prison, furniture and fittings, \$8,500; naval prison, administration building, to complete, \$10,000; in all, \$188,700.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the portion of the paragraph after the word "dollars," in line 21, down to and including the word "dollars," in line 3, on page 32.

I should like to ask my colleague in reference to these items in the bill and which propose new work.

Mr. FOSS. What particular items?

Mr. MANN. It is the blasting in front of the quay wall, prison laundry, cooking school and baking plant, and the naval prison. There are a number of naval prisons provided for, I believe, in this bill.

Mr. FOSS. The principal naval prison is at Portsmouth. Then there is one at Boston, and that is all on the Atlantic coast. I want to say that the estimates for the navy-yard at Portsmouth amounted to several hundred thousand dollars, but the committee went carefully over them and concluded to report these items, amounting, in all, to \$188,700. The estimates, in fact, were over a million for the navy-yard, and we went over

the subject thoroughly with the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks and got down to the bed rock of what he believed to be absolutely necessary for that navy-yard for the coming year, and this is the result.

Mr. MANN. The estimates were over a million dollars?

Mr. FOSS. Over a million dollars.

Mr. MANN. And how much did you recommend?

Mr. FOSS. One hundred and eighty-eight thousand dollars.

Mr. MANN. There are a number of items in here in reference to quay walls, etc. Here is one for blasting in front of the quay wall, to cost \$110,000.

Mr. FOSS. Yes. The Chief of the Bureau said it was important to blast this rock if we were going to handle heavy-draft vessels there at that navy-yard. These items of dredging and of quay walls are carried more or less in connection with the navy-yards in every appropriation bill, and they have to be carried.

Mr. MANN. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I move to strike out, on page 31, lines 21 to 23:

Blasting in front of quay wall (to cost \$110,000), \$50,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 31, line 21, strike out "blasting in front of quay wall (to cost \$110,000), \$50,000."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, this is a provision to appropriate \$50,000 to commence blasting at this navy-yard. It is to blast out rock almost immediately in front of a dry dock. The dry dock was authorized some years ago at a cost of \$1,000,000. After the dry dock was completed \$765,000 was appropriated to remove Hendersons Point, in order that battle ships might go up to the dry dock, and now the committee is authorizing an appropriation of \$50,000 to commence blasting out rock right in front of the dry dock, the total cost to be \$110,000. In a former appropriation bill \$25,000 was appropriated for the same purpose, so that this condition now exists: A million dollars was appropriated to build a dry dock, and \$900,000 will be expended to enable ships to get into the dock. It seems to me that it is about time that expenditures for the purpose of enabling ships to reach that dry dock should cease. It might just as well have been built out in the prairies and a channel dug from the Gulf into the middle of the continent as to have put this dry dock where it is.

This is a very innocent provision. The limit of cost is not \$110,000, but merely as descriptive, merely for the information of the House, it is stated that it is to cost \$110,000. If the \$50,000 be appropriated, it will be necessary next year to appropriate the additional \$60,000. It appeared in the hearings that the chairman of the committee said to the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks:

I thought we had sufficient depth.

Admiral ENDICOTT. We have in the harbor, but not right in front of the dry dock. It is one of the deepest harbors on the coast.

But the dry dock apparently was built where it was known that a ship could not readily enter. Then after some further discussion—

The CHAIRMAN. Right in front of the dock?

That is, is this blasting to be done there?

Admiral ENDICOTT. Yes, sir; to one side.

The CHAIRMAN. Have you used the dry dock?

Admiral ENDICOTT. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Can you get a big battle ship in?

Admiral ENDICOTT. Yes, sir. It lies right in front of the quay wall. You can not lay a vessel up there if she draws 26 or 27 feet, because there is danger of grounding and injuring her.

The CHAIRMAN. If she draws less you can?

Admiral ENDICOTT. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. There are other places along the quay wall where you can put the vessels?

Admiral ENDICOTT. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. There is plenty of space?

Admiral ENDICOTT. No, sir. This is right on the quay wall adjoining the dry dock, where you want to moor a vessel before taking it into the dry dock.

Several items in this bill contemplate an investigation as to the manner in which the navy-yards have been conducted. It seems to me that it would be more proper to investigate the bureaus that designate such places for the location of dry docks. When Congress authorized \$1,000,000 for a dry dock, it was a reasonable assumption that the dock would be built at a place where a ship could go and where there was ample water. We learn now that after \$1,000,000 has been appropriated for the dock it requires \$900,000 additional to enable ships to get into the dock. The evidence is that there is ample space, that ships have gone into this dock, that it has been utilized, and it seems to me that it is wise now to stop, and stop here, this everlasting blasting of rock at this yard. Let us save this appropriation and put it to better use.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I call for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York.

The question was taken; and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Navy-yard, New York, N. Y.: Electric plant, extensions, \$25,000; underground conduits, extension, \$15,000; heating system, extensions, \$20,000; electric motors for pump well valves, \$7,000; electric elevators, \$10,000; central power plant, to complete, \$140,000; in all, navy-yard, New York, N. Y., \$217,000.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 33, line 4, after the word "dollars," insert the following: "flagging the sidewalk of Flushing avenue and Navy street, in front of the navy-yard, \$10,800."

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, this amendment has been recommended for the past four years by the civil engineer at the New York Navy-Yard. This sidewalk extends around the entire yard and has never been flagged. The members of the committee can appreciate the condition of any public building in their respective cities if the sidewalks were not flagged. They can see what condition of things would exist in front of the public buildings in Washington if the sidewalks were not flagged.

Mr. MANN. Is the gentleman aware that the Government of the United States does not feel obliged to build sidewalks or pave streets?

Mr. CALDER. I am not asking the Government to pave the street. I know that the sidewalks in front of the post-office in Brooklyn and the post-office in New York City were flagged by the Government. All the Government buildings in New York City have sidewalks flagged by the Government.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Chair make an inquiry of the gentleman. Does the amendment propose to flag a public sidewalk?

Mr. CALDER. Yes; in front of Government property.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that the fee of the sidewalk is not in the Government.

Mr. CALDER. It is; the fee of the Government extends to the center of the street.

Mr. PERKINS. The gentleman does not mean to say that that is so in the city of New York?

Mr. CALDER. Yes.

Mr. PERKINS. I think that the gentleman will find that the fee is in the public in the city of New York.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I discussed for two days in the last session of Congress this identical question on the side of the gentleman from New York, and I was unable to persuade the gentleman in the chair [Mr. Watson] that I was correct.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. Did not the proposition of the gentleman from Illinois involve the paving of the street?

Mr. MANN. In that case the title to the roadway and the sidewalk was precisely the same.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. My recollection is that the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Watson], then in the chair, held the proposition out of order, because it went beyond the sidewalk.

Mr. MANN. Oh, no.

The CHAIRMAN. That was the point in the mind of the Chair. A proposition to flag a sidewalk on Government property would be in order, but on the highway not on Government property it would not be in order.

Mr. CRUMPACKER. In the State of Indiana, and I think in most of the States where the public streets are established, the public has an easement only. The rule may be different in the State of New York, but in the State of Indiana and in the State of Illinois the fee, subject to the easement of the public, is in the adjoining lot owner, and upon the vacation of the street the entire fee reverts to the adjoining property owners. I do not know what is the rule in Brooklyn, but the gentleman who proposes the amendment says that that is the rule in the city of Brooklyn.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair does not know what the facts are in reference to that.

Mr. MANN. The facts are that the sidewalk which this amendment proposes to flag is in the street. It is a part of the street and is not a part of the Government property. As to whether the Government has the fee subject to the easement of the street, I take it, is not in point, because that is the identical question I presented to the chairman last year, and he held that it made no difference. This property is in the street—the sidewalk is in the street.

Mr. PAYNE. May I ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] if his proposition a year ago was not to pave to the center of the street in front of the post-office in Chicago?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, the distinction between whether it is one part of the street or another part of the street may be a distinction which can be drawn by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. PAYNE], but I fail to distinguish the difference between paving one part of the street and paving another part of the street, so far as the point of order is concerned.

Mr. PAYNE. There may be something in that. So far as the ownership of streets is concerned in the State of New York, as the chairman well knows, the city owns the street fee and all in some of the cities, and in others the abutting property owners own the fee of the streets, and in some cities the streets are owned by the city in some localities, and the abutting owners own to the center of the street in other localities. Unless we can have some testimony from the gentleman from New York [Mr. CALDER] on this subject, I do not see any point in the discussion. It might go over for the purpose of obtaining further information.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the amendment may go over until to-morrow without prejudice, in order that the gentleman may ascertain who owns the fee of the street.

Mr. CALDER. I have no objection to its going over.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection to its going over, but the case I presented last year was a case where there was no doubt about the Government owning the property. I would be very glad to have the Chair rule that it is in order to pave property outside of the Government ownership.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] asks unanimous consent that the matter may go over until to-morrow without prejudice. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. TIRRELL, having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 20990. An act to create a new division of the southern judicial district of Iowa, and to provide for terms of court at Ottumwa, Iowa, and for a clerk for said court, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 8365. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to cancel certain Indian allotments and substitute therefor smaller allotments of irrigable land, and providing for compensatory payments to the irrigation fund on lands so allotted within the Truckee-Carson irrigation project;

S. 8252. An act to construct and place a light-ship at the easterly end of the southeast shoal near North Manitou Island, Lake Michigan;

S. 6731. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth H. Rice; and

S. 8182. An act authorizing the Twin City Power Company to build two dams across the Savannah River above the city of Augusta, in the State of Georgia.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

Navy-yard, Washington, D. C.: Paving, to extend, \$10,000; grading, to extend, \$10,000; quay wall, \$25,000; railroad bridge and tracks, \$40,000; in all, navy-yard, Washington, \$85,000.

Mr. SOUTHARD. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 33, after the word "dollars" in line 15, insert:

"For brass and iron foundry to cost \$300,000, \$100,000."

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania raises the point of order against the amendment. Does the gentleman from Ohio desire to discuss the point of order?

Mr. SOUTHARD. Mr. Chairman, I will say just a word on the point of order. I have nothing special to offer except this: The gun factory in the Washington Navy-Yard is an institution that is established by law. The foundry for which this appropriation is to be made, if it is made at all, is a necessary, an absolutely essential, part of this gun factory.

The CHAIRMAN. May the Chair inquire of the gentleman from Ohio right there if there has been a foundry there heretofore?

Mr. SOUTHARD. There has been a foundry there. There is a foundry there now, and this is simply a provision for the building of an additional foundry, as I understand it. It does not seem to me that it is subject to the point of order at all.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the gentleman to say that this is to construct an addition to the foundry now there?

Mr. SOUTHARD. It is to construct a foundry. Whether it is to be a new and independent foundry I do not know, but I understand that the foundry already there was constructed in pursuance of this provision of law establishing the gun factory at the Washington Navy-Yard. It does not seem to me that it is possible that this proposed amendment is subject to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Can the gentleman from Ohio refer the Chair to the provision under which the foundry was originally established there?

Mr. SOUTHARD. I can not; but if there is any question about it I would like to have this paragraph passed over.

Mr. MUDD. Mr. Chairman, if I may be permitted to interrupt, there is no doubt, as a matter of fact, that there is a building there now of the same character and to do the same work as is proposed to be done by this appropriation in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio, and, if I may be allowed—if the gentleman will indulge me—the nonapplicability of the point of order, so to speak, is on all fours with what in my judgment seems to be the almost universal trend of the decisions on similar matters heretofore. The Government owns the land. There is no land to be acquired. The Government has been carrying on this work of a gun factory, I don't know for how many years, but certainly for a great many years. It is no new proposition in any sense whatever.

All the decisions thus far for many years as to the construction of buildings of this kind on land owned by the Government, with the single exception of some erroneous decisions, in my judgment, upon dry docks, have all been against the point of order. The present occupant of the Chair has ruled upon as many of them, perhaps, as any other Chairman of the Committee of the Whole. Down at the Naval Academy, at the West Point Military Academy, and at a number of other places where the Government owned the land, where it had been carrying on business and where it was attempting to build up a part of the naval establishment, the decisions have always been in favor of admitting the provision.

Mr. SOUTHARD. Mr. Chairman, it is a necessary part, without any question, of the gun factory. You can not have a gun factory in any proper sense of the term without having a foundry. It is a part and parcel of the gun factory itself. It is to do the very kind of work that has been done there ever since the gun factory was established. It is simply a continuation of a public work already in progress and comes clearly, as I believe, within the provisions of the rule and is not subject to a point of order.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Chairman, if there is a foundry on the premises that is capable of doing the work necessary to be done in carrying on this factory, then very clearly it is subject to the point of order, because it is a proposition to introduce an additional work in that yard. It is a proposition to put up a new establishment. It is not a continuation of an existing work. It is no proposition to extend an already existing foundry, to fit it with new tools, or to do anything of that kind, but it is to build an additional foundry to undertake additional work, and it comes very clearly, in my judgment, within the line of a great many rulings, within the point of order made by the present Chairman on a paragraph when the Indian appropriation bill was under consideration, when it was proposed to erect and equip a shop for manual training, to which proposition the gentleman now in the chair made the point of order that that was an additional branch of education and subject to the point of order, and so held, and this is on all fours with that case.

Mr. SOUTHARD. Mr. Chairman, it strikes me there is no difficulty in distinguishing between that case and this, and the amendment carries with it the suggestion that at least the present foundry is not sufficient for the purposes of the gun factory, otherwise no appropriation would be offered for the foundry. It is as much a part of the gun factory, as much an essential part of the gun factory as any other part of the gun factory, and there can be no question about it.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would be clear on the subject provided the amendment provided for an addition to the gun factory or for an addition to the brass and iron foundry, but so far as the amendment shows on its face here there is not anything showing it is an addition to a work in progress.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, in order that

the Chair may be as well informed as he can be informed, I shall repeat what others well informed have repeated in my presence. This is not a gun factory. Make no mistake. It is a navy-yard. At this point there are assembled numbers of pieces and the gun is put together. At no time has a gun forging been made or cast at this plant. The castings are made elsewhere and brought to Washington, and the gun is then made up, as it is called, using the technical phrase.

Mr. ROBERTS. Machined.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. It is machined, as my colleague [Mr. ROBERTS] suggests. Mr. Chairman, this is the beginning of a new enterprise in the Washington Navy-Yard. It is true more than sixteen years ago a small appropriation was made, out of which and by use of which they established in this navy-yard a little foundry. In that foundry they make certain tools or certain machines or certain instruments useful in the Navy.

Mr. SOUTHARD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. I wish to impress, if I can, upon the Chairman the understanding of the point of order which I have made. It is proposed by this amendment to begin in this navy-yard—my statement is based upon the evidence of the men who are in charge of the project—a plant that will cost this Government fully \$3,000,000. That statement, Mr. Chairman, may not bear particularly upon the point of order pending, but I desire to impress the Chair with the statement that the amendment offered is the beginning of a new proposition, a new enterprise. There is a little foundry, it is true, as I said, in which they melt every day a certain number of tons of ore, all that is necessary for their present purposes. Another foundry is necessary, however, for other purposes not now employed at this navy-yard.

It is not proposed by this appropriation, Mr. Chairman, to extend that work. It is proposed by this appropriation to put in this navy-yard at Washington a new, an absolutely new, branch of business that has not heretofore been used—namely, a foundry—and for what purpose? To make gun castings and to make gun-carriage castings. Mr. Chairman, the last statement I have to make is this: That up to this time they have never made those castings. They now propose by the use of this money to erect a foundry to make them.

Mr. TALBOTT. Why does the gentleman call the Washington gun foundry a small foundry? It is one of the two that the Government owns. The Watervliet—

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. It is not a gun foundry at all. They call it a gun factory or gun foundry, but it is known in the law as the Washington Navy-Yard.

Mr. TALBOTT. Is there not a gun factory in the Washington Navy-Yard?

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. It is true that in this navy-yard there is a place where guns are finished, as I have said to the Chair—if the gentleman please, I am directing my remarks to the Chair—and while, perhaps, we call this a gun factory, it is not in the law known as a gun factory.

Mr. TALBOTT. What is it, then? Has it not been recognized in legislation and as a matter of fact as the gun factory in the Washington Navy-Yard, the biggest one in the United States?

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. No, sir; it has not.

Mr. TALBOTT. It has.

Mr. PAYNE. I would like to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] if this was simply a proposition to enlarge the factory, so they could do more work of the same kind, could it not be easily provided for by the appropriation of, say, \$15,000 or \$20,000, to make all of the addition necessary to do the increased work of the same kind that is being done in the foundry?

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. It could; but such appropriation is not asked for.

Mr. PAYNE. What is asked for, as I understand, is to tear down the present building from the foundation and build a new and larger building, that will accommodate not only the work done now, and enlarged work of that class, but also work of a different class.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. That is true.

Mr. MUDD. It is to carry on the same work.

Mr. SOUTHARD. In order to ascertain definitely what is asked for, I desire to read just a moment from the hearings taken before the Committee on Naval Affairs in December last. I read from the testimony of Admiral Mason, on page 45, as follows:

The reasons for requiring this item have been so fully stated they can only be reiterated. A new foundry is indispensable for the economy of the gun factory. It is the most needed of all the improvements that

could be recommended. The present foundry is antiquated and inadequate in size and unsuitable as a foundry for an institution like the Naval Gun Factory. On account of its insanitary condition it is a menace to the health of the employees and officers of the yard in its present situation. The Government loses every year by not having better facilities would soon equal the amount requested to properly provide for all the requirements of this portion of the plant, and its increased product would materially add to the production of armament by this factory, saving in both time and expense.

I read that, Mr. Chairman, for this purpose—for the purpose of satisfying the Chair that the work intended to be done by this foundry is precisely the work which has heretofore been done by the foundry which is already in existence in the navy-yard; nothing different at all. It is a forging plant, as suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER]. It is no new departure from the work which this navy-yard has been carrying on ever since it was first erected. And it would seem that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has radically changed his opinion from what it was a year ago when he made a point of order against a similar proposed amendment to this bill. I read from page 6843 of the RECORD. Practically the same proposition was presented as an amendment by the late Mr. Rixey, of Virginia, and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER] made the point of order. I will read from the RECORD:

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania reserves the point of order on the amendment.

Mr. RIXEY. I should like to have the point of order disposed of.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to discuss the point of order?

Mr. RIXEY. I do not care to discuss the point of order. I am willing to submit it. There is now at the navy-yard a brass and iron foundry.

Mr. LITTLEFIELD. What do you want another one for?

Mr. RIXEY. I was going to explain that.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. After a minute's reflection, I think that the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia is in order. In order that he may not be embarrassed, and that we may discuss the facts, I will withdraw the point of order.

Now, the gentleman from Pennsylvania one year ago was clearly of the opinion that this amendment was not then and would not be now subject to a point of order.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. I am perfectly willing to stand by what I then said. My recollection is the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. RIXEY] desired that there should be a vote. I may have said that, in my judgment, the amendment that was offered was in order. I had not looked at the proposed amendment carefully, but I have examined the precedents, Mr. Chairman, since yesterday, and I am convinced now that the amendment offered is not in order.

Mr. WALDO. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that this is drawing the point of order a little finer than it ever has been in the past. The work that is done in this gun factory foundry is part of that factory, and the only purpose here is to increase the facilities of that foundry, because they are now too small and insanitary; and clearly a point of order does not lie to this as to any new enterprise. The "Naval Gun Factory" is the enterprise, and this amendment proposes necessary additional room for it; and this room is needed, as Admiral Mason said, for the purpose of making trial castings. It is not for the purpose of transferring all the business of casting naval ordnance to this yard in preference to private foundries, but that the Naval Gun Factory may make trial castings which the naval authorities are unable to get from the private foundries. This amendment is clearly for a mere increase of the facilities of the present Naval Gun Factory. That is all it is for.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, just a word. I entirely agree with my colleague in regard to this foundry proposition for the Washington Navy-Yard. Money has already been appropriated for this very purpose, and this is only a continuing appropriation. This appropriation is to increase the facilities, to enlarge the foundry establishment, so that the men there can have steady work and do proper work. At the present time, to my personal knowledge, the work of the Government can not be done, and the Navy Department asks for this appropriation. It ought to be made. We ought to make our own gun material. We are now, and for many years have been, making in this Washington Navy-Yard the greatest guns in the world, guns that stand the greatest tests and shoot the straightest.

We are making them by American workmen, and, in my opinion, it is the best gun factory in the United States, if not in the world, and this appropriation ought to be made. What is the use of building great battle ships if we have no guns to put on them?

There is no reason in the world why these men who work at the navy-yard should be laid off half the time—thrown out of employment. There is no reason in the world why we should not enlarge this plant so that it will be able to turn out the guns as fast as they are needed. I am in favor of the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio, and I trust the point of order

will be overruled and the amendment agreed to by the committee.

Mr. WALDO. Permit me to add to the testimony of Admiral Mason read, something that was omitted. Something, I think, the House ought to know in considering this matter. The Admiral said, page 45 of the hearings on this bill:

At the present time the yard factory is working up to its extreme capacity, and in case of war the emergency conditions could not be met. We are now practically at a standstill on account of our inability to obtain castings due on existing requisitions.

Mr. SOUTHARD. One word. I understand that there is no contention that this gun factory was not established by lawful authority; that is, by act of Congress. The erection of a gun factory, the authority to erect a gun factory, would carry with it the authority to do anything reasonably necessary for the manufacture of guns. I think there is no doubt about that proposition. You can not make a gun, you can not carry on the business of manufacturing these guns at least without a foundry. Nobody will make any contention of that kind. So that, if a foundry is necessary for making guns, I do not see why we can not appropriate for one foundry, two foundries, or a dozen foundries, if they become necessary for the proper conduct of the business of making guns in that factory.

I do not see why we can not appropriate for a forging plant, for they must have forgings in the construction of guns. It is the contention of the gentleman from Pennsylvania that the ultimate purpose of this proposition, or appropriation provided for in this amendment, is to establish a forging plant. I deny that, however. But even if it were, if forgings are necessary for the manufacture of guns, and you can not make a gun without forgings, why would not authority to establish a gun factory carry with it the authority to erect a forging plant?

The CHAIRMAN. The merits of any proposition or the desirability of any proposed work should not be considered by the Chair in determining whether the proposed work can be appropriated for in a general appropriation bill. What the Chair is to determine is procedure, not merit; and the Chair, accepting as correct the statement of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER], and differentiating between the present situation and the additional buildings at the Naval Academy and an additional war ship, which have been specifically ruled upon, the former rulings having been followed by the present occupant of the Chair on a former occasion, and at that time the present occupant of the chair stating that he was controlled by a specific ruling theretofore made, differentiating between that situation and this, and calling to the attention of the House particularly a decision made by a chairman, the occupant not now being remembered by the present occupant of the chair, but where the present occupant on the floor made a point of order against a provision for the creation of a manual training building for an Indian school, the point of order being sustained.

Properly interpreting the rules and the general line of decisions made thereunder, and drawing a distinction between the general line of decisions and those special decisions in reference to battle ships and in reference to the two academies, the Chair is constrained to hold that the amendment, as now presented, is not within the rule and decisions, and therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. SOUTHARD. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask to have the amendment changed, so as to read:

For an addition to brass and iron foundry (to cost \$300,000), \$100,000.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Let the Chair inquire of the gentleman from Ohio, at the time the present foundry was authorized was there a limit of cost put thereon?

Mr. SOUTHARD. I am not advised.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will assume that there was not.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as the act of Congress was passed sixteen years ago, and the Chairman has asked a question upon which he should be correctly informed, because it is very important to know, I will ask that this may be passed over until we can obtain the statute.

Mr. TALBOTT. I will say to the Chair that the language of the amendment adopted by Congress, authorizing the establishment of the gun-foundry site, was for the establishment of a gun foundry for the manufacture of guns adapted to modern warfare.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair thinks he should have that statute before him, but if the Chair may suggest to the gentleman from Ohio, the amendment without the limitation in it, in the absence of a limitation in the original act, the Chair would be constrained to hold to be in order. Unanimous consent is asked that the matter go over without prejudice until to-morrow, or until the original statute can be produced.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, will the Chair hear further argument to-morrow?

The CHAIRMAN. To-morrow, or at any time to-day. The unanimous consent is that it go over until the original statute can be produced.

Mr. SOUTHARD. I think some time had better be fixed, say to-morrow morning.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio makes his request that it may go over until to-morrow morning, when the committee takes the bill up for consideration. Is there objection to that request?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

Navy-yard, Charleston, S. C.: Stone and concrete dry dock, to complete, \$50,000; grading and paving, \$15,000; railroad system, extensions, \$15,000; dredging, \$50,000; conduit system, extension, \$10,000; sewer system, extension, \$5,000; central power plant, \$30,000; railroad equipment, \$5,000; crane track, extension, \$34,000; heating system, extensions, \$15,000; electric system, extension, \$10,000; in all, navy-yard, Charleston, S. C., \$239,000.

Mr. LEGARE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from South Carolina offers an amendment, which will be reported to the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend by striking out the word "fifty" in line 20, page 33, and inserting the word "ninety-eight" in lieu thereof; also by striking out "crane track, extension," in line 24, page 33, and inserting the words "quay wall" in lieu thereof.

Mr. MANN. I reserve the point of order to the latter part of that amendment.

Mr. LEGARE. Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment for the following reasons: The dry dock at the navy-yard at Charleston is about completed. In possibly a month the dock will be completed and ready for use. Between the dock proper and the river, where the water is deep, there is a quantity of soft mud which it is necessary to remove. Now, the estimate from the Navy Department is \$98,000 for the removal or dredging of this mud and earth. The committee has allowed in the bill \$50,000. I understand from the admiral now in charge, the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks, Admiral Rousseau, that if this entire estimate of \$98,000 is granted by the House at this time this dock can receive vessels within a year. I have a letter from him, from which I quote as follows:

Sir: In compliance with your request, the Bureau has the honor to submit the information desired by you in regard to the item of "Dredging, \$50,000," page 33, line 20, of naval bill (H. R. 24925) reported January 25, 1907, by quoting the following extract from a report made to the Secretary of the Navy on this matter, dated February 1:

"The opening up of the Charleston Navy-Yard as a repair station practically hinges on the completion of the stone and concrete dry dock. The body of the dock, which has been set in from the river bank several hundred feet in order to secure a suitable foundation, is practically completed. In order that the dock can be used it will be necessary to extend the wing-wall approaches sufficient to retain the earth embankments, and it will be necessary to dredge out the soft mud and other material between the dry-dock entrance and the river channel. The river channel has ample depth. An estimate of \$98,000 for this dredging work was approved by the Department. The naval bill carries \$50,000. In order to permit vessels to enter the dock the whole amount asked for, \$98,000, will be necessary. It is respectfully requested that the item of dredging, therefore, be increased from \$50,000 to \$98,000, as originally estimated."

From the above it will be seen that the completion of the approach immediately in front of the dry dock will be delayed for another year unless the item of dredging can be increased from \$50,000 to \$98,000, as originally estimated, at this session of Congress.

Now then, Mr. Chairman, we have down there this dry dock about completed and the Government navy-yard, upon which has been expended several million dollars, and in order to have it ready within a year from date we want this slight increase. If the bill is not amended as suggested and this additional increase had for dredging, all this capital expended and in fact the entire yard will lie idle for another year, and, understanding this, I trust the committee will accept the amendment.

Mr. MANN. In the last year \$10,000 was appropriated for this purpose. How is the money expended, by direct labor or by contract?

Mr. LEGARE. I understand that in order to carry this work on and hurry it to completion, Admiral Rousseau, who has been in charge of the yards and docks for about a month, is arranging to secure for the War Department the use of a mud dredge so that the work may be done right away.

Mr. MANN. So there would be no object in increasing the amount because a contract was to be let for the total amount?

Mr. LEGARE. No; this is entirely legitimate.

Mr. MANN. Yes; it is legitimate to let it by contract.

Mr. LEGARE. I did not mean it in that sense.

Mr. MANN. I was trying to help the gentleman out.

Mr. LEGARE. The latter part of this amendment provides that instead of the \$34,000 for the crane-track extension, we

should change it to the quay wall, which is necessary to get the dredging through in time.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman proposes to substitute the quay wall for the crane track. Is there not a distinction?

Mr. LEGARE. The difference is this: You can not put any crane track on until the quay wall is there to put it on. I have changed the quay-track extension to the quay wall. You must have the quay wall first before you can put the track extension on it. It is also necessary to have that little piece of quay wall before we can do the dredging or the dirt will slide in.

Mr. MANN. If it is for the same purpose I have no objection, but if it is proposed to substitute for an item reported by the committee something else entirely different, I should object.

Mr. LEGARE. No; it is for the same purpose and in connection with the dredging.

Mr. FOSS. I wish to say a word, Mr. Chairman, on this amendment. It was recommended by the new Chief of Bureau of Yards and Docks, who was appointed about a month ago. The estimate as originally sent in was recommended by the old chief of the Bureau, and since the new chief has been appointed he has gone down to Charleston and made a special investigation, and since the bill has been reported to the House he has recommended this change, an increase of the amount of dredging and the change of appropriation from a crane track to a quay wall.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order. The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina.

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Navy-yard, Norfolk, Va.: Paving and grading, additional, \$10,000; railroad tracks, extensions, \$8,000; rebuilding coal wharf, \$25,000; telephone system, extensions, \$2,500; electric plant, extensions, \$20,000; machine shop for steam engineering, to complete, \$25,000; concrete and granite dry dock, to complete, \$100,000; improvements to 100-ton shears, to complete, \$20,000; repairs, buildings, St. Helena, \$25,000; in all, navy-yard, Norfolk, Va., \$235,500.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the gentleman, the chairman of the committee, for some information in relation to the navy-yards. How many navy-yards are there?

Mr. FOSS. They are all mentioned in the bill.

Mr. PERKINS. Are any of these navy-yards completed, or are they ever to be completed? I see that there are large appropriations apparently for the purpose of construction in reference to every navy-yard in the United States.

Mr. FOSS. Every year there are items for improvement in connection with the navy-yards. I may say that they are never, in one sense, completed. There are new buildings and new docks required year after year, and the business of the committee has been to keep these estimates down as much as possible.

Mr. PERKINS. Of course I can understand that there would be current repairs, but I should suppose that a navy-yard, like any other building establishment, could be built so that with proper repairs there would not be any further expense for additional construction.

Mr. FOSS. That would be so if our Navy remained just so large and no larger, but we are increasing the Navy right along, building new ships, and we have, to a certain extent, to increase the buildings in the navy-yard.

Mr. PERKINS. How long has the Norfolk yard been established?

Mr. FOSS. Oh, that has been established a great many years. It is one of the oldest yards.

Mr. PERKINS. Has the gentleman any idea of how much has been expended in buildings of the Norfolk Navy-Yard altogether?

Mr. FOSS. Probably in the neighborhood of seven or eight million of dollars all told, running over a great many years. In the New York Navy-Yard, for instance, we have expended \$25,000,000, running back sixty or seventy years.

Mr. PERKINS. I see on the Norfolk Navy-Yard there is an appropriation for a concrete and granite dry dock, to complete, \$100,000. Can the gentleman tell us what that is?

Mr. FOSS. That is for a dock which has been in course of construction there for a few years, and this appropriation is to make the last payment upon it. The dock cost in the neighborhood of \$1,250,000.

Mr. PERKINS. Hasn't there always been a dry dock there?

Mr. FOSS. Oh, there are two or three docks there, just as there are at New York and Boston in the navy-yards.

Mr. PERKINS. This was for an additional dock?

Mr. FOSS. This was an additional dry dock at the time we started to build it.

Mr. PERKINS. Are these changes all made necessary by the enlargement of the Navy?

Mr. FOSS. They are.

Mr. PERKINS. Enlargement of the Navy, or because the old navy-yards have got out of condition?

Mr. FOSS. Well, they are due to both reasons, but if you build up the Navy you have to increase the number of docks. In Portsmouth, England, there are twenty docks, and you will find them right side by side, some of them over a hundred years old.

Mr. PERKINS. Are these allowances made on the recommendation of the various gentlemen who have charge of these navy-yards.

Mr. FOSS. They are made on the recommendation of the bureau chiefs, which are submitted to the Secretary of the Navy and revised by him and then sent to the committee.

Mr. PERKINS. May I ask, without impertinence, whether the committee follows the recommendations of the various bureau chiefs, or whether they are recommended independently by the committee itself?

Mr. FOSS. We have hearings upon these estimates, I will say, and all the bureau chiefs are before us, and we examine into all of these things as far as we can. This year the estimates for the Norfolk yard amounted to over a million dollars—\$1,288,000—but we have recommended in this bill \$235,000.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question in that connection. A moment ago we passed an amendment here offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEGARE], raising an appropriation from \$50,000 to \$98,000 for the completion of some work at the navy-yard at Charleston.

Mr. FOSS. Yes; dredging right in front of the dock.

Mr. PAYNE. I understood the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss] to say that the reason for this additional appropriation was that they had a new superintendent who had gone down there and reported, and although the former superintendent thought it could be done for \$50,000, this new superintendent made a report in favor of \$98,000, which had come to the committee after the bill had been reported. Is that correct?

Mr. FOSS. Yes; the new chief was appointed after hearings upon this matter.

Mr. LEGARE. Will the gentleman yield to allow me to answer that question?

Mr. PAYNE. I want to get at what the gentleman from Illinois said.

Mr. LEGARE. But the gentleman is mistaken.

Mr. PAYNE. In that connection I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss] if that thing occurs often—that when there is a new superintendent sent to a navy-yard or a new officer the estimates change because of some change in the plan or something of that kind? In other words, whether we have a permanent policy as to each navy-yard or whether every time we change a commandant or a superintendent the plans change and the cost is increased on account of that?

Mr. FOSS. I want to say that this constant changing of the civilian head of the Navy has been a matter of some embarrassment to the committee, and that when a new civilian head comes in there is a new policy. Of course with reference to the new Chief of Yards and Docks he was recently appointed, and he went down and made a special investigation of this navy-yard, and other navy-yards, and came back and recommended that we make this provision. The original estimate, however, under the old chief, was \$98,000, but in our hearing we came to the conclusion with him that \$50,000 would be all that he could expend that year.

Mr. PAYNE. And the hearing was with the old chief?

Mr. FOSS. Yes.

Mr. PAYNE. But I notice you put it in the bill for the completion of the work \$50,000.

Mr. FOSS. No; not to complete.

Mr. PAYNE. Perhaps I am mistaken about that. Then I understand the gentleman that with the change of civilian superintendents—and I suppose the same thing would apply if a man happened to be an officer of the Navy—there is liable to be a change in the plans?

Mr. FOSS. There is.

Mr. PAYNE. That makes increased expenses for the maintenance of these yards?

Mr. FOSS. New policies are usually adopted by new chiefs of bureaus.

Mr. PAYNE. Is that any reason why these Government yards are unable to compete, in the construction of battle ships, in price with yards owned by private owners, where the management is continuous under the same policy? Is that one reason why it costs more to build ships in the Government navy-yards?

Mr. FOSS. Well, that is probably one reason; but the principal reason is that the men in the Government yards work only eight hours a day, whereas in private employment they work nine and ten hours, and then the wages paid the men in the Government navy-yards are larger than in outside yards, and then men in the Government navy-yards have holidays. For instance, during this last year in the Washington Navy-Yard they had ten holidays, I believe, but they usually have as many as seven in one year, and all of these things enter into the question as well as, of course, the question of management.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn. There was no objection. The Clerk read as follows:

Navy-yard, Mare Island, Cal.: Railroad system, extension, \$5,000; electric-plant system, extension, \$10,000; sewer system, extensions, \$3,000; heating system, extension, \$5,000; telephone system, extensions, \$1,000; electric capstans for dry dock No. 1, \$10,000; extension of building No. 119, block and cooper shop, \$15,000; improvements to building No. 96, ship-fitters' shop, \$3,000; improvements to buildings Nos. 69 and 71, \$20,000; improvements to coal cylinders, \$7,500; workshop for electrical class, \$3,000; channel moorings, Mare Island Strait, \$9,000; enlarging and moving dispensary building, \$6,000; improvements to naval prison, \$50,000; in all, navy-yard, Mare Island, \$147,500.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, in lines 12 and 13, the words "improvement to naval prison, \$50,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 35, lines 12 and 13, strike out the words "improvements to naval prison, \$50,000."

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, this bill carries \$106,000 for naval prisons. Since the fiscal year 1901, including the appropriations in this bill, there have been appropriated for naval prisons \$408,200. It seems a very extraordinary thing that these very large expenditures should be necessary for naval prisons. There are in the Navy to-day some 32,000 enlisted men. The testimony shows that during the past year there were added to the Navy 13,418 men, separated from the service, 8,701 men, and the net increase was 4,717 men. The desertions amounted to 3,998. More than 10 per cent of the entire enlisted force of the Navy deserted. For several years the Department has been stating that a superior class of men have been obtained. It has been a matter of congratulation for the Department that the recruiting parties have gone into the rural districts and have obtained a class of men considered superior to those heretofore enlisted in the Navy; and yet, ever since the Department has been congratulating itself upon the fact that a superior class of men has been enlisted, the appropriations for the naval prisons have gone up correspondingly and the desertions have increased in a like ratio.

It seems that if the conditions were improving that either there is something radically wrong in the administration of the service or else the conditions must be so unsatisfactory that the enlisted men can not continue in the service. I am inclined to believe that the ordinary farm hand, who has been accustomed to living with the farmer as a member of the family, upon an equality with members of the family, treated as an equal, when he enlists in the Navy and finds the conditions so different from those to which he is accustomed as soon as he reaches shore he immediately quits the service. There should be some means of reaching this condition. There can be no excuse for so large a number of desertions from the service if the conditions are what they should be. The same condition does not exist to such a degree in the Army, and yet even in the Army the desertions are very large.

A short time ago, Mr. Chairman, in looking through a book I ran across a little thing that seemed to some extent to illustrate the reasons for the conditions that make men desert both from the Army and from the Navy. This particular thing, I do not know just how to describe it, while it refers to the Army, in my judgment applies equally to the naval service. It is a fact that the conditions in the Navy are such that even more than in the Army it compels men, by reason of conditions they find there, to desert. The sharp line of distinction that necessarily is drawn between the enlisted man and the officer tends to create the dissatisfaction that exists. I will read this effusion to illustrate to some extent at least what causes the great dissatisfaction among the enlisted men:

I used to boss him in the store
And oversee his work,
For I had charge of one whole floor,
And he was just a clerk.
To-day it's different, if you please;
We've changed respective pews;
I'm private in the ranks, and he's
Got stripes
Down
His
Legs.

The girls, whose smiles were once for me,
Now scarce vouchsafe a glance,
Such great attraction can they see
In decorated pants.
The erstwhile clerk no longer my
Indulgence begs.
I'm down below; he's up on high,
With stripes
Down
His
Legs.

It's "Private Jones, do this and that;"
In haste I must bestir.
To Jenkins, on whom oft I've sat,
I'm told to answer "Sir!"
One born to rule, it's come to pass,
Of woe I drink the dregs;
I'm in the Army with, alas,
No stripes
Down
My
Legs.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I hope, Mr. Chairman, we shall discontinue increasing our prisons, and make some provision to induce men to remain in the service.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD].

The question was taken; and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Navy-yard, Puget Sound, Washington: To continue grading, \$10,000; electric-light plant, extensions, \$6,000; water system, extensions, \$5,000; heating system, extensions, \$5,000; roads and walks, extensions, \$2,500; stone and concrete dry dock, to continue, \$200,000; quay wall, extensions, \$30,000; in all, navy-yard, Puget Sound, Washington, \$258,500.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word in order to ask the chairman of the committee a question or two. I noticed in the hearings that the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks states that officers' quarters are very scarce in this yard and recommends, if possible, that the committee make an appropriation of \$8,000 for additional quarters. Will the chairman state why the committee could not see its way clear to make that appropriation?

Mr. FOSS. We went over very carefully with the Chief of the Bureau all of the estimates which were furnished or sent up to the committee, and he pointed out to us those which he regarded as the most essential for the coming year and these we put into the bill.

Mr. JONES of Washington. In the central power plant he recommends \$130,000 extension, and says that that is needed at the yards. Was there any further showing made by him? He says that this extension is needed there.

Mr. FOSS. We did not provide for it, but we thought we would not do the work in all of the yards during the same year; that we would extend it along for a year or two, or even three, perhaps, in working out this system of consolidation. We have to take a yard or two up at a time.

Mr. JONES of Washington. With reference to the officers' quarters he states:

I think it would be advisable to appropriate for one of these, \$8,000.

Mr. FOSS. We came to the conclusion that we could not do so this year.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Navy-yard, Pensacola, Fla.: Machinery for central power plant, \$35,000; naval prison, \$28,000; conduit system, \$2,500; improvements to storehouse, building No. 25, \$5,000; in all, navy-yard, Pensacola, \$70,500.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the naval prison, in line 25.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman state what it is?

Mr. FITZGERALD. In line 25, page 35, "naval prison, \$28,000." I think I have a decision that naval prisons are not in order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make it or reserve it?

Mr. FITZGERALD. I make it. I think it would be cruel and inhuman punishment to imprison men in Pensacola.

The CHAIRMAN. There is no question but that this has been heretofore provided for, the Chair assumes?

Mr. FOSS. There is a naval prison there at the present time, and has been for a number of years. This is a new naval prison.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. LAMAR. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Florida [Mr. LAMAR] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 36, line 3, after the word "dollars," insert:
"One stone dry dock, to cost not exceeding one million one hundred thousand;"

On page 36, line 4, strike out the words, after the word "Pensacola," "seventy thousand five hundred dollars" and insert "\$170,500."

Mr. VREELAND. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against that.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. LAMAR. Mr. Chairman, I ask the gentleman to reserve the point of order.

Mr. VREELAND. I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. LAMAR. Mr. Chairman, I shall say little in criticism of the Committee on Naval Affairs, because that is the committee out of which I expect this graving dock to come now or eventually. But the people of my district can not understand why it is that with so many strong and favorable recommendations from the Navy Department for the construction of this stone graving dock at Pensacola the Committee on Naval Affairs does not recommend it. They would be very much disinclined, Mr. Chairman, to think, or even suggest, a sectional reason for the nonconstruction of this proposed stone-graving dock at the Pensacola Navy-Yard, but they can not help reflecting upon the number of stone graving docks throughout the North and throughout other portions of this great country, other than the far southern section of the United States. Let me read the number of graving docks in existence and under construction in this country:

Portsmouth, N. H., two—one floating dock and one graving dock; Boston, two graving docks; New York State, four graving docks; League Island, Pa., two graving docks; Mare Island, Cal., two graving docks; Puget Sound, Wash., two graving docks; two in the Philippine Islands, and one at Guantanamo, Cuba. And, Mr. Chairman, in the South, three graving docks at Norfolk, Va.; two floating docks at Pensacola, one of them marked "unserviceable," and one floating dock at New Orleans. Such disparity has raised a feeling in the section from which I come that the Naval Affairs Committee has not done justice in the past and is not now doing justice to one of the greatest harbors, if not the greatest, in the country. I mean the harbor at Pensacola, Fla. The channel entrance of Pensacola Harbor is over 32 feet and the harbor from 35 to 50 feet deep. The 20,000-ton battle ships contemplated in the present naval bill will not have a draft greater than 28 feet, and the channel entrance of Pensacola Harbor is so straight that, without a pilot, these great battle ships, costing from \$5,000,000 to \$10,000,000, can enter with safety.

Admiral Capps has recommended this stone graving dock, stating in his report that Pensacola is of importance strategically in time of war to the United States Government. Admiral Endicott has recommended it in his past reports.

Now, Mr. Chairman, why leave Pensacola out? Why place in this bill a floating dock costing one and a half millions, while its location is not even fixed? Why leave out that character of docks, fixed and permanent, built of stone, that the Navy Department declares to be the proper style of graving-dock for this country? Every naval authority that I have conversed with, or whose reports I have read, fear to place these great masses of steel and iron upon a floating dock, where by the slightest quiver this great piece of machinery may be thrown into permanent disorder and probably wrecked in value. Why leave Pensacola out of this bill year after year when it is recommended by the high authorities of the Navy Department?

I repeat, I would be disinclined, and do not on this occasion raise or suggest the sectional question; but I repeat that the people of Pensacola and the people of the far South can not understand why it is that the Navy Department so uniformly recommends the construction of this graving dock, and it is so uniformly eliminated from the naval bill. From Norfolk to Galveston there is but one stone graving dock, and that is only in the process of construction in the harbor of Charleston. Does that appear fair? I do not say that it is unfair, but, I ask, Does it appear fair?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LAMAR. May I have two or three minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LAMAR. Now, let me suggest to the gentleman who raises the point of order that in this bill there is a provision for a floating dock. That proposition will go out of this bill on a point of order as this amendment will go out if a point of order is made and sustained. The Secretary of the Navy has requested that this floating dock be constructed. Why make this point of order? Why make any point of order against the bill upon these proposed docks? Let the gentleman who has made the point of order permit this stone graving dock at Pensacola to be put in the bill; and if any gentleman desires to make the point of order upon the floating dock provided for in this bill let him suspend his point of order and let the two

docks go through. This at least will only confirm the recommendation of the Secretary of the Navy, Admiral Capps, and Admiral Endicott.

So I say, in conclusion, to the gentleman who has made the point of order, withdraw it and let there be a vote in the committee upon this proposition.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York insist upon his point of order?

Mr. VREELAND. Mr. Chairman, the committee feel that they have devoted to the maintenance of yards and docks all that ought to go in the bill this year, and they insist upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. OLMSTED having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. PARKINSON, its reading clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 7211) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend an act to construct a bridge across the Missouri River at a point between Kansas City and Sibley, in Jackson County, Mo.," approved March 19, 1904.

The message also announced that the Senate insisted upon its amendments to the bill (H. R. 23551) making appropriation for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, and agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. WARREN, Mr. FORAKER, and Mr. BLACKBURN the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendment to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 925) for the construction of a steam vessel for the Revenue-Cutter Service for duty in the district of Puget Sound, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, and agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. ELKINS, Mr. PERKINS, and Mr. MALLORY the conferees on the part of the Senate.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval station, New Orleans, La.: Improvement of water front, \$25,000; levee improvement and grading, \$25,000; central electric light and power plant, extension, \$50,000; railroad system, \$5,000; drainage system, \$10,000; central heating plant, \$18,000; paving, \$10,000; quarters for commandant, \$12,000; fitting up yard buildings 8 and 16, \$4,300; dispensary building, \$9,000; in all, navy-yard, New Orleans, \$168,300.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the words "quarters for commandant, \$12,000," in lines 11 and 12.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule, if nobody desires to discuss the question.

Mr. MANN. I am perfectly willing to reserve the point of order, if that is desired. I understand that Congress heretofore provided an appropriation of \$10,000 for quarters for the commandant, and then afterwards consolidated it with another building, and that the quarters have been built for the commandant. Now, a proposition comes into the bill for entirely new quarters for the commandant, although the paint is hardly dry on the old ones.

Mr. MEYER. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] is mistaken. There has been no understanding that there should be no authorization for commandant's quarters, nor is there any building appropriated for costing \$34,000. The facts are that in 1903 an appropriation of \$10,000 was made for commandant's quarters, and at the same time \$14,000 for two officers' quarters, and in 1905 for two additional officers' quarters \$10,000. Later it developed that the appropriation for the four officers' quarters, aggregating \$24,000, was inadequate; hence Congress authorized application of the \$10,000 for commandant's house to the cost of the four quarters, say, \$8,500 each, deferring appropriation for the commandant's quarters to a later period.

The commandant of the station during the last few years has had his residence in the city of New Orleans. But the time has arrived when it is necessary to provide such quarters at the navy-yard, and this appropriation should be made. It is recommended by the Secretary of the Navy in his estimates.

I have some doubt as to whether the amount, \$12,000, will be sufficient. The Secretary suggested \$15,000, but the committee, in its wisdom, presumed that \$12,000 might be adequate. I do not think the gentleman will regard it as unreasonable that the

commandant of that important station should have suitable quarters, and I hope he will withdraw the point of order.

Further, it will prove a saving to the Government. The present officer in command draws commutation of \$60 per month. At 2 per cent, this would mean on \$36,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, there was \$10,000 heretofore carried for quarters for commandant, and only two years ago we provided that that \$10,000 should be consolidated with \$14,000 theretofore carried for two officers' quarters, and the two sums were further consolidated with another sum of \$10,000 previously appropriated for another two officers' quarters. Now, the plea was made at that time that this would provide quarters for the commandant and that there was no necessity for having separate quarters, and they have a building there now appropriated for to the amount of \$34,000.

Mr. MEYER. If the gentleman will allow me, the aggregate of those appropriations which the gentleman has referred to is \$34,000 for four officers' quarters, or \$8,500 for each. They are inadequate even for the number of officers to be provided for, exclusive of the commandant, and while it is true, as the gentleman has stated, that at one time it was intended that one of these buildings should be for the commandant, the provision which he has just read indicates clearly that that was not the intention of Congress, and the four buildings which have been referred to are the only buildings for officers' quarters at that station now.

Mr. MANN. When we appropriate in three different appropriations, and then come in under the plea that we will take care of them all by consolidation and appropriating \$34,000 for four quarters, Congress is quite liberal.

Mr. MEYER. It is the duty of Congress to provide quarters for officers, and certainly four officers' quarters are not more than are necessary for the officers at that station, leaving out the question of quarters for the commandant. The reason for these changes is simply this: In the first place Congress did not appropriate enough. We first appropriated for four officers' quarters at \$6,000 each, supposing that might prove sufficient. Subsequently that amount was found inadequate because of the advance in cost of materials and labor, so now this is the position: We have appropriations for four officers' quarters, \$34,000, or \$8,500 each, which is small in view of the extreme cost of building material, etc., and no provision for commandant's quarters. I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this is not unreasonable, and I hope that the gentleman will withdraw his point of order.

Mr. MANN. I dislike very much to make a point of order against the distinguished gentleman from New Orleans, but after all his naval station is pretty well taken care of in the bill, and it seems to me this is not a proper item. I must insist upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval station, Olongapo, P. I.: Water system, \$40,000; quay walls, \$50,000; closing Binickigan and Tinaligman rivers, \$25,000; in all, \$115,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph. This is the commencement of appropriations to turn aside the two rivers that run through the naval station, or through the reservation. The next step will be to remove the mountain that is upon it, and which the Department reports will require over 9,000,000 cubic yards of material to be removed.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I want to disabuse the gentleman's mind. We have received a cablegram that the rivers are closed, and I was going to move to strike out the appropriation for that purpose.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Was it done by an act of Providence?

Mr. FOSS. No; by a previous appropriation. [Laughter.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does the gentleman ask unanimous consent to strike out the \$25,000 appropriated for the closing of these rivers?

Mr. FOSS. Yes; I move to strike out the words "closing these rivers, \$25,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In lines 19 and 20 strike out the words "closing Binickigan and Tinaligman rivers, \$25,000."

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to. Mr. FITZGERALD. Now, Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the balance of the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves to strike out the balance of the paragraph.

The question was taken; and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the Clerk may have authority to correct the totals.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that where amendments are made changing the totals the Clerk may be authorized in each case to change the totals to correspond. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval station, Cavite, P. I.: Extension of building No. 64, \$7,500; boat-storage shed, \$4,000; improvement of naval prison, \$1,500; in all, \$13,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Is it intended to continue to make appropriations for both naval stations within 40 miles of each other in the Philippine Islands, or is it intended eventually to abandon one of them?

Mr. FOSS. So far we are keeping up the naval station at Cavite for the repair of ships. At Olongapo the dock is situated, and that is where we dock the ships.

Mr. FITZGERALD. How many years will it be before they can do any work at Olongapo?

Mr. FOSS. I do not know. They already do a little repair work there in connection with the docking of the ships. Whenever ships are docked we use the old Spanish station at Olongapo, and we have provided some tools for them for light repairs.

The pro forma amendment was withdrawn.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval station, Culebra, Porto Rico: Clearing and grading, \$1,500; fencing, \$500; in all, \$2,000.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the chairman of the committee whether there is any definite plan of extending the naval station at Culebra?

Mr. FOSS. There is no intention to have any navy-yard there. Our fleet, however, goes down there every winter and has target practice.

Mr. JONES of Washington. They make it simply a rendezvous?

Mr. FOSS. Yes; but they have a few tools there, where they can make light repairs.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval station, Tutuila: Barracks for native guard, \$5,000; operating room, \$1,000; in all, \$6,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on the "barracks for native guards, \$5,000." I want to know what the native guard is and what it has to do with this bill.

Mr. FOSS. Admiral Endicott asked for barracks for native guards, grading and filling, and for an operating room, a total of \$14,000.

Mr. MANN. An operating room for a hospital, or for guns? Mr. FOSS. We did not allow all that, however. What we did allow was simply for an operating room and for barracks. The total asked for was \$14,000, and that was recommended by the chief of the bureau. All we allowed was barracks for the native guards, \$5,000.

Mr. MANN. And the operating room, \$1,000.

Mr. FOSS. Yes; but not the full amount of \$14,000.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Let me say to the gentleman from Illinois that the Surgeon-General wants to build a small operating room.

Mr. MANN. In connection with hospital work?

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Yes.

Mr. MANN. What is the necessity for barracks for the guards? I thought they slept outdoors in that country.

Mr. FOSS. This is what he says in the report, "That the building now in use by the native guard is inadequate and in a very bad condition, and it is contemplated to construct a modern frame building for the use of the guard and devote the old building to the use of the prison."

Mr. MANN. How much of a guard is there?

Mr. FOSS. I could not tell the gentleman how many men there are who act as guards there, but probably a considerable force.

Mr. MANN. What does the guard do? Does it guard the navy-yard against the natives or against approaching war ships?

Mr. FOSS. I think it looks after public property. Tutuila is a naval station, and that is all there is to it. We own it. It is the naval station where our ships stop from time to time on their way across the Pacific, and we always have in connection with these stations a guard of men. Sometimes we call them watchmen. In this case it is a guard of natives, which is very much cheaper than if we provided American watchmen. It seems to me that it is necessary over there that there should be a guard of some kind. I should not want to be over there all alone without one of some character.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order. The Clerk read as follows:

Steel floating dry dock: One steel floating dry dock (to cost not exceeding \$1,400,000), \$100,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the paragraph.

Mr. MUDD. Will the gentleman reserve his point of order?

Mr. MANN. I reserve it temporarily.

Mr. MUDD. Mr. Chairman, in view of the decision of the Chair as to the dry dock just proposed for Pensacola, I think I might make a fairly safe prediction in stating that I feel that I can "see my finish" on this proposition at this time, in this House, unless I shall be able, in the very brief observations I shall have time to make, to convince the gentleman from Illinois, who has but recently remarked that he disliked to make points of order, that he ought to withdraw the point of order that he has made against this provision.

Mr. MANN. I can assure my distinguished friend from Maryland that if he convinces me, that there would likely be a number of gentlemen in the House who would still be unconvinced.

Mr. MUDD. Very well; I will, at any rate, undertake to convince Members of the House of the merits of this proposition, and I shall have to be brief in the remarks that I shall submit.

The report of the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks to this session of Congress, which I hold in my hand, contains this statement as to the reasons for this dry dock. It will be found on page 68 of his report:

STEEL FLOATING DRY DOCK.

This estimate is submitted to provide for the commencement of the construction of a steel floating dry dock, capable of taking up an injured vessel drawing 37 feet of water, which draft can not now be accommodated by any dry dock in the United States.

It proceeds further on to state that the facilities at Norfolk are not sufficient for this purpose, and that this dock, if constructed, would be capable of lifting a ship of 20,000 tons—that is to say, a disabled ship of that displacement, which, in his judgment, as I understand it, would require a depth of water of about 37 feet. In other words, the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks in effect states that if we shall go ahead and construct battle ships of the *Dreadnought* class, of the kind that we appropriated for last year and that we are proposing to appropriate for this year, allowing for the increased draft that such ships would have in a disabled condition, that there is not a dry dock in the United States to-day capable of lifting and repairing such a ship. It does seem to me that it is worth while for us to have one dry dock in the United States capable of lifting a disabled ship of the character of the *Dreadnought* that we are intending to build in the future.

I have before me an official statement from the Bureau of Yards and Docks giving the depth of water over the entrance sill of the existing docks in the country. As a general thing the greatest draft of those now constructed is about 30 feet. In two of the docks that are provided for, but not yet constructed, namely, Charleston and Norfolk, there is a requirement for 34 feet, and that is the greatest depth of any dry dock, either existing or contemplated, and these docks would not take in a disabled ship of the class and draft of the *Dreadnought*. The statement goes on further to say that even to get to the dock at Charleston or Norfolk there would have to be some expenditure for dredging, in order to get a depth of channel sufficient to make the dock available. I did not know that so soon would come the verification of that statement by an appropriation, which has just been made by an amendment to this bill, providing an amount of money for dredging, in order that ships might get up to the new dock provided for at Charleston.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MUDD. I will.

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman know where this dry dock will be located and constructed?

Mr. MUDD. I will undertake to enlighten the gentleman on that point. I can only say, Mr. Chairman, that by a process of natural and appropriate selection, by analogy to the doctrine of the survival of the fittest, and in further view of the information given in the hearings, I am of the opinion that this dry dock if constructed will be located or, to a large extent, utilized at the mouth of the Patuxent River, opposite a place called Solomons Island, in my district, and I do not undertake to deny that my interest in it is somewhat accentuated and spurred on by the evidence that comes to me because of that proximity in that section of my district, and the consequent opportunity for observation of the advantages of that place. But, Mr. Chairman, why will it go there, if at all?

Mr. MANN. Because the gentleman represents the district, I suppose that would be a sufficient reason.

Mr. MUDD. Oh, no, Mr. Chairman. A year ago there was some intimation to the effect that I was actuated by the fact that this dry dock would perhaps go in my district in my somewhat zealous advocacy of it, and the intimation was also thrown out that perhaps there would be added likelihood of its going there because of the fact that we happened at that time to have from Maryland a Secretary of the Navy. That Secretary of the Navy, in the recent procession of prominent Cabinet members through the Navy Department to other stations, has gone elsewhere, and that reasoning would not now apply. I will say to the gentleman, however, that were this gentleman from Maryland now in the Navy Department, I take it for granted in selecting a site for the location of this dock he would have something of a civil-service examination made of the various harbors in the country, and that would likely result in the dock going to Solomons Island, because that happens to be the best place in the United States for such a dock.

Mr. MANN. Why is that the best place to have this dry dock?

Mr. MUDD. Because we happen to have there over a wide extent of area of water a depth of from 60 to 100 feet. We are appropriating money in this naval appropriation bill and have been so appropriating in naval appropriation bills for several years past, as well as in river and harbor bills, to get a sufficient depth for battle ships to get to the dry docks and harbors of the country, while we have at that place, without any occasion for the expenditure of a single cent, a sufficient depth of water to accommodate any battle ship that the mind of man can conceive of being constructed in the next hundred years. It so happens, Mr. Chairman, that Providence has seen fit to ordain that ships requiring a big draft should some day seek entrance into the mouth of the Patuxent River, in so creating the world as to make there the best harbor on the face of the globe. I am now endeavoring to act in accord with and seeking to recognize and fortify the judgment and the wisdom of Providence.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I dislike very much to stand in the way of Providence—

Mr. MUDD. But, Mr. Chairman, I realize that I am having a hard task before me, at this time and place, if I can not move the obdurate heart of the gentleman from Illinois to withdraw his point of order. I rather apprehend that the Chairman, acting upon the erroneous precedents of the last few years, culminating in the most erroneous one of all of last year against the construction of dry docks without previous authorization, will not perhaps desire to overturn the precedents, ill-founded and erroneous as I think they are. There is just one other point to which I wish to refer. The gentleman from Indiana, in making his decision last year, stated in the language which I have before me now that the "question for decision" was "whether a floating dry dock is an essential part of the equipment of the Navy," and he stated further that such a dock could only "be taken from place to place when the sea is calm."

I apprehend that such language would no longer be used after the experience of the dry dock *Deucey*, which since that time has thrown new light upon the situation and makes a new condition to which parliamentary law should be applied, in making a trip of about 11,000 miles through gales and storms such as hardly any battle ship is subject to, going a longer distance than the famous journey of the *Oregon* from Bremerton to the West Indies during the Spanish war; and I will say further, in this connection, that the official report of the Navy Department, a statement of which I have here, shows that the deviation out of the line of a perpendicular of the side walls of that great steel structure was only about 4 degrees on the Atlantic Ocean and about 6 degrees in the Mediterranean; perhaps not as much of a roll as on an ordinary battle ship, and the men who constituted the crew of that dock, which I claim to be in effect a ship, were not subject to as much seasickness as those of the towing and convoying ships.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. MUDD. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. I understand the gentleman to say that our present dry docks will not take in the ships provided for in this bill. Am I correct?

Mr. MUDD. Not entirely. I base my remarks upon the statements, or at least upon the clear and unavoidable inference from the statements, of the report of the Chief of Bureau of Yards and Docks that a ship of the kind we are providing, with a few feet allowed for the additional draft needed, if such a ship was disabled, that we have no dry docks in the country which would take in a ship in such a condition.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. I will state that Captain

Wainwright's opinion, found on page 293 of the hearings, is that we have dry docks which will take in the ships we propose to build under this bill.

Mr. MUDD. Oh, yes; take them in a normal condition, that is right. Just barely take them in. The *Dreadnought* will have, when loaded, about 29½ feet of draft.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. But the ships we propose will have a draft of 27½ feet, we believe.

Mr. MUDD. That also is the draft when the ship is unloaded—that is to say, from the information I received this morning from the Bureau of Navigation, the *Dreadnought* will have, when loaded with coal and other supplies that necessarily will have to go on board of her, a draft of a little in excess of 29 feet.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. And several of our docks have a draft of 30 feet.

Mr. MUDD. I understand, Mr. Chairman; but we do not put battle ships in the docks when they are in a normal condition and when they do not need repair. We send them there when they are disabled; and Admiral Endicott and others, I apprehend, will vouch for the statement—I make it from information gained from them—that you have to allow about 5 feet to a ship disabled from one cause or another.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. I understand some dry docks have even greater depths—one has 31 feet and two have 34 feet.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MUDD. Mr. Chairman, I ask for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. MUDD] asks for five minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. I understand one of our docks has a greater depth than that. The one at Guantanamo has 37 feet.

Mr. MUDD. We have abandoned the dock at Guantanamo, and the gentleman and myself both concurred in doing it.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. The dock that is in contemplation?

Mr. MUDD. We do not contemplate any dock there, because the gentleman will remember—

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. I will state that the gentleman did, I believe, after long meditation, join with me in opposing that dock.

Mr. MUDD. I admit, Mr. Chairman, that it frequently takes some time of meditation for me to get up to the point where the gentleman from North Carolina starts off.

Mr. Chairman, I think we can fairly rely upon the statements of the Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks and the other officers connected with that Bureau, who are supposed to be familiar with the subject-matter, as to the depth of our docks and the additional and abnormal draft that will be required by a battle ship in a disabled condition; and it is clear that the Chief of the Bureau in the statement in his report as to this steel floating dry dock means unequivocally to convey the impression that a disabled ship of the class that we are calling a "Dreadnought" will require about the depth of water which he there speaks of, or approximately that.

We may safely assume that there will be a requirement under such a condition of 35 feet. The largest and deepest dry docks that we have as yet provided—because we have none of that depth constructed—are those at the navy-yards of Norfolk and Charleston, that are to have a depth of 34 feet, and that depth, as I understand it, is the depth that they will have at high water, which can not by any means be counted on; and we will have to appropriate money, as I have already stated, for dredging, in order that our battle ships may approach and be enabled to enter into these docks.

The truth of it is, if we will look over the naval appropriation bills for the last few years, and consider in connection with them the items for similar purposes in the various river and harbor bills, it will be found that I am not wide of the mark when I make the statement, as I do, that the money we appropriate in each Congress, certainly in two Congresses, in order to obtain a sufficient depth for the battle ships that we are building to bring them up to the docks would more than pay the total expense of the steel floating dry dock of the class that we are seeking to provide for in this bill.

So that, considered from the standpoint of economy, as well as efficiency for the purposes for which it is to be used, such a dry dock, in my opinion and in the expressed opinion of the admiral in charge of that branch of the service, would be a very valuable addition to the naval establishment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Secretary of the Navy is authorized to make a thorough investigation regarding the cost of articles or material manufactured by the

Government in navy-yards and naval stations, and the cost of like articles and material purchased in the open markets, and report to the next Congress the information obtained and the difference found in such cost, and such other information as he may deem advisable.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman desire to discuss the point of order?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Only to say this, that I think this is in line with the duty of the Secretary of the Navy. Similar information to this is continually obtained in response to resolutions of inquiry.

Mr. FOSS. I know, and for that reason I do not see that the point of order would lie against this in the appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Buildings for lepers, island of Guam: Naval station, island of Guam: Buildings for lepers and other special patients, island of Guam, \$4,000; maintenance and care of lepers and other special patients, \$16,000; in all, \$20,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order against the provision. I wish to inquire whether these lepers are kept at this naval station at present?

Mr. FOSS. They are. If the gentleman will read my report, he will see that I have placed in it an extract from the report of the Secretary of the Navy, in which he especially urges this appropriation.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I will make the point of order against that part of the paragraph that provides for the building, so as not to effect the maintenance at present.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman make the point of order against lines 22 and 23, beginning with the word "buildings" and ending with the word "dollars?"

Mr. FITZGERALD. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval magazine, Puget Sound, Washington: For necessary buildings, water and fire system; fencing, clearing, and grading; railroad tracks, and equipment of the naval magazine, Puget Sound, on ground recently acquired for the purpose, \$75,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph, lines 7 to 11, page 43. There are a great many provisions in the bill in reference to naval magazines and constructing new magazines. This provision authorizes the commencement of any sort of building that may be thought necessary, as it says "for necessary buildings." It seems to me that the gentleman ought to have some limit of cost upon the buildings in some way, or some limit as to the building. Of what are these buildings to consist, may I ask my colleague, and what are they to cost?

Mr. FOSS. Well, this is to be a fully equipped magazine, and it will cost when fully completed \$153,000 and the items are given on page 71 of the hearings—one gun-cotton house, \$24,000; four magazine buildings, \$28,000; one shell house, \$17,000; an administration building; fuse house, primer house, a workhouse, and so forth. There are seventeen buildings in all.

Mr. MANN. Does the law provide in any way a limit of cost upon these buildings?

Mr. FOSS. No; but we make provision for them this year.

Mr. MANN. Well, the item makes provision by an appropriation of \$75,000 for necessary buildings. There is no limit upon it at all. If they commence with a \$25,000 building upon any sort of plan that they may have, it would be in order to make an appropriation every year for them. Why not put in a limitation of the expense in some way?

Mr. FOSS. It is right within the control of the committee. I have no objection if the gentleman wishes to put in "not to exceed \$153,000, \$75,000." That is within the control of the committee anyway.

Mr. MANN. In the control of what committee?

Mr. FOSS. To recommend to the House.

Mr. MANN. Oh, well, I understand that, of course.

Mr. FOSS. Now, if the gentleman desires, after the word "purpose," to insert "the cost not to exceed \$153,000," I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. HULL. But that would limit the cost of grading the avenues, the material, and buildings, and all.

Mr. FOSS. That would limit everything in connection with this naval magazine.

Mr. HULL. I notice you have an appropriation for fencing, clearing, and grading.

Mr. FOSS. We do where they are now.

Mr. HULL. I think it would be dangerous to limit the cost for grading and clearing. It should not apply to anything except the building.

Mr. FOSS. Clearing and grading has been figured in this estimate at \$10,000. It covers everything. I say if the gentle-

man desires to limit the cost of the magazine I have no objection.

Mr. MANN. I move to insert, after the word "purpose," in line 11, the following words:

The total cost of the building at said naval magazine not to exceed the sum of \$150,000.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. Will the gentleman permit me to say the estimated cost of the building does not amount to that?

Mr. MANN. Let us find out what it is.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. It is on page 71. It seems that these buildings are estimated to cost just about \$100,000. The cost for the other items are: One reservoir and tank, \$24,000; railroad system, \$15,000; water and fire system, \$5,000; clearing and grading, \$10,000. In all, about \$54,000; so that the cost of the buildings would be \$99,000.

Mr. FOSS. If the gentleman will just put this in, "not to exceed \$150,000," that will include all that is meant in that paragraph. It will cover everything.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. But that would limit the amount of grading, so that if you provided for it hereafter, a point of order would be good against it.

Mr. FOSS. Yes; it would. But they have made a sufficient estimate here to cover it.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will accept this amendment, I will withdraw the point of order. "The total cost of the improvements of said grounds not to exceed the sum of \$153,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "purpose," in line 11, page 43, insert:
"Total cost of the improvements to said grounds not to exceed \$153,000."

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval Observatory: Grounds and roads: Continuing grading, extending roads and paths, clearing and improving grounds, \$10,000.

Mr. GILLET. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out that paragraph, for the purpose of asking the chairman what is the purpose of making that appropriation of \$10,000?

Mr. FOSS. Well, the purpose is expressed in the language of this section: "Continuing grading, extending roads and paths, clearing and improving grounds, \$10,000."

This appropriation has run for a number of years. This tract at the Naval Observatory covers a large number of acres, and they have gradually been making improvements in connection with the grounds.

Mr. GILLET. I would like to ask the gentleman a little more definitely what he means by that. I know, of course, all about the observatory, but I do not see why they should keep on laying out the grounds and paths at the Naval Observatory, making a pleasure park of it.

Mr. MANN. They do not do it, either. I walk out there nearly every Sunday.

Mr. FOSS. I have not the statement now showing just how the money was expended during the last year, so that I can not inform the gentleman what the principal items of expenditure are.

Mr. MANN. During the last year they have done some grading out there and done some filling and improving the roads a little bit. Now, I do not know from reading the hearings what this appropriation is needed for, but I walk over these grounds very frequently, and up to the present I should say their money has been very properly expended. Whether it should be continued in the future I would not undertake to say. It has only been recently that the grounds about the Naval Observatory have been graded and grassed.

Mr. GILLET. Unless there is some definite information, it seems to me that this appropriation might go out. The Naval Observatory I personally consider rather an excrescence. It is a beautiful spot of ground. We are not doing any new building there, and it does not seem to me that we ought to be spending \$10,000 a year just for ornamental purposes about a building of this kind, which I can not see is of any practical use.

Mr. ROBERTS. Let it go over until to-morrow.

Mr. GILLET. Let it go out.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I hope this will not be stricken out. It comes with the recommendation of the Secretary of the Navy. Although I have not the information here to show just how this money was expended during the last year, I trust it will remain in the bill this year. I call for a vote.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out lines 16 to 18, both inclusive, on page 43.

The question being taken, the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Public works under Bureau of Medicine and Surgery.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Carolina offers an amendment, which will be reported by the Clerk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 43, line 20, after the word "surgery," insert "Naval Hospital, Canacao, Philippine Islands: For the construction of additional wards, \$50,000."

Mr. MANN. I reserve the point of order on that, Mr. Chairman, until I know what the facts are.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, the substance of this amendment is very strongly recommended by the medical department of the Navy.

On page 116 of the hearings Surgeon-General Rixey says that we have a modern tropical naval hospital there with a capacity of 120 beds, and that it should be increased to accommodate 200 patients. He further says that it is only necessary to add bed space to accomplish this, as administration facilities, the expensive part of the hospital, are already provided for. He further says that this hospital is admirably located; that he has visited it himself, and personally knows of its condition.

I now read from the annual report of the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery, found in the last Annual Report of the Secretary of the Navy, on page 53:

The hospital has a ward capacity of 100 patients. As this number has been almost constantly exceeded during the past six months, the necessity for additional wards is apparent. The present excellent hospital building is inadequate in size for the proper accommodation of the patients now admitted. As it is the only naval hospital in the Philippine Islands, its enlargement is imperative.

When it is considered that with the personnel of the Asiatic fleet and the complement of marines in the Philippines, together with a large civil population entirely dependent upon naval hospital facilities—there are approximately 10,000 persons to be provided for—the need of the station for a hospital accommodating at least 200 beds becomes apparent.

The Bureau earnestly recommends that Congress be asked to make an appropriation, to be immediately available, for the construction of these necessary improvements.

Mr. MANN. Do you make this immediately available?

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. No, sir; the amendment does not propose that.

Mr. MANN. Let me ask the gentleman how many sailors have we over there—members of the Navy?

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. That can not be stated definitely.

Mr. MANN. Approximately.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. I am unable to approximate it, but all of our sailors who operate in the waters adjacent to the Philippine Islands must go to that hospital, as it is the only hospital in the Philippines.

Mr. MANN. Is the gentleman himself absolutely satisfied that in order to give proper hospital attention to sailors over there these accommodations are needed?

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. In order to give proper accommodation to persons who ought to be admitted and for whom we ought to make preparation, I am satisfied this is necessary.

Mr. MANN. I mean the sailors.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. That would include other than sailors.

Mr. MANN. Well, in connection with the Navy and Marine Corps.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. I think so.

Mr. MANN. I am willing to take the gentleman's judgment in reference to it. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. PERKINS. I reserve the point of order.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. Before I finish let me add that there were over 600 patients treated there during the last year. There were something over 600 patients treated there during the last year. When we began this fiscal year there were 104, and I have already read the statement showing that this hospital for the last six months covered by the Surgeon-General's report was somewhat crowded.

Then, in a communication of February 2, 1907, the Surgeon-General says:

The naval hospital at Canacao is the only naval hospital in the Philippine Islands. It is an excellent building, with a fine location, but is inadequate in size, and its enlargement by the construction of additional wards is absolutely necessary.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. Is not the recommendation of the Surgeon-General for increased accommodations there for the purpose of accommodating patients from the civil population, and not from the naval forces or from the marine forces?

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. The only information which I have I have read, in which he said there would be a population of all included of 10,000. The very fact that he limits it to

10,000 shows that it does not include the general population of the Philippine Islands, or even the territory adjacent to the hospital.

Now, further, Mr. Chairman, in this communication he says:

The appropriation requested is \$50,000 for additional wards and \$20,000 for the erection of quarters for the medical staff outside of the hospital building proper, the location of the hospital being so far removed from Manila and Cavite as to render it necessary that the medical officers attached to the hospital shall live within the compound.

Now, Mr. Chairman, as to the point of order. I desire to say that I did not include in my amendment any proposition to build these officers' quarters because I recognize that the building for officers would be subject to a point of order, in my judgment. This amendment provides for additional wards to the present hospital building. I take it that no one who has read the Surgeon-General's report to the Secretary of the Navy, or who has read his testimony, or who has looked into this matter can doubt that that is a splendid hospital and well located, and that there is a necessity, certainly in the opinion of the Navy Department, for the increase of wards. Now, in my judgment, if the Chair will bear with me—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is ready to rule on the point of order.

Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN. I think that the addition of wards to that building there would not be subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands that this is to provide for additional wards to an existing hospital now in operation, and that can be done in this manner if the committee desires to do it. It is a question for the committee and not for the Chair. The point of order is overruled, and the question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from North Carolina.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. WILLIAM W. KITCHIN) the ayes were 22 and the noes 33.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval hospital, Pensacola, Fla.: For the renewal of the present hospital buildings, \$15,000, and for the erection of quarters for the medical staff outside the naval hospital, \$10,000; in all, \$25,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order on that.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of getting some information.

Mr. MANN. I reserved the point of order because I wanted some information.

Mr. PERKINS. I want to ask the chairman of the committee about another point. If the chairman of the committee will be kind enough to turn to page 41 of the bill he will see that there is an appropriation toward a naval magazine on the New England coast, and it says "toward the erection of the necessary buildings on ground the purchase of which is now under negotiation." The same statement was contained in the bill last year, and I would like to ask whether the land has been bought, or whether the appropriations are made for buildings to be erected on lands the purchase of which have not been completed?

Mr. FOSS. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts can better inform the gentleman than I can, but I think the land is now under condemnation proceedings.

Mr. ROBERTS. Mr. Chairman, a considerable portion of the land has already been acquired, but there are some portions remaining that are now under condemnation proceedings, awaiting the action of the court. It is thought that all the land will be acquired, so that the work can be commenced on the ground and the buildings erected in the next fiscal year.

Mr. PERKINS. There was an appropriation last year for the same purpose. What has been done with that money?

Mr. ROBERTS. The appropriation for last year will be used largely in paying damages under the condemnation proceedings. The expense of acquiring the land has turned out to be much greater than the Department estimated in the beginning of the undertaking.

Mr. PERKINS. Has any land been acquired upon which the buildings can be erected for which we are asked to make an appropriation?

Mr. ROBERTS. I understand so. I understand that considerably more than one-half the land has been acquired for some time past.

Mr. PERKINS. How much will be the entire cost of the land, if the gentleman knows, or about how much?

Mr. ROBERTS. There is no way of telling, because that will depend upon what the verdict of the jury may be.

Mr. PERKINS. What does the gentleman expect the cost will be?

Mr. ROBERTS. We can not make any estimate of it. I can

tell the gentleman what the Department estimated the cost to be in the first instance, and that was \$70,000.

Mr. PERKINS. But the gentleman can not estimate how much it will cost in the end?

Mr. ROBERTS. I have no doubt but that it will cost \$100,000, over and above that amount—that is, \$170,000 in all.

Mr. PERKINS. Their estimate was a very inaccurate estimate.

Mr. ROBERTS. The estimate as given by the Department stated that the land was assessed for \$35,000, and in their judgment could be purchased for \$70,000. That is the information the committee acted upon.

Mr. PERKINS. Then a Massachusetts jury on land assessed for \$35,000 proposes to make the Government pay \$170,000?

Mr. ROBERTS. Oh, Mr. Chairman, we have land in Massachusetts that we would not sell for ten times its assessed valuation—plenty of it.

Mr. PERKINS. What is the system of assessment in Massachusetts?

Mr. ROBERTS. It varies in every community. It depends upon the expenses of the community—how much money they have to raise by taxation; how much personal property may be owned in that town; how much real estate, etc.

Mr. PERKINS. That is the amount of taxation collected, but the assessment is on the value of the property.

Mr. ROBERTS. Oh, no, indeed; we do not assess up to the full value, and there is nothing in our law that requires the assessors to put an assessment of any percentage of the values upon the property.

Mr. PERKINS. What do they base their assessment on, upon caprice?

Mr. ROBERTS. I am trying to explain to the gentleman. In some of our communities property is assessed at more than its market value, much more. I would like to sell the gentleman some property over in Massachusetts at its assessed value.

Mr. PERKINS. I have no desire to buy it.

Mr. ROBERTS. On the other hand, I know of property there that he could not buy for many times its assessed value. It depends on the debts of each community, on the amount of personal property and real estate owned there. It is not regulated by law.

Mr. PERKINS. I should think it depended a good deal on the caprice of the assessors, according to the statement of the gentleman.

Mr. ROBERTS. To some extent. Sometimes they raise their money by a high tax rate and low valuation and sometimes by high valuation and low tax rate. There is no uniformity of practice in respect to that in our State. The criticism, if any, in this respect would be upon the appraisers that the Navy Department secured to appraise that property in the first instance. I would not personally give much for their judgment when they said that land could be purchased for \$70,000 in view of what has transpired since, in view of the prices that we are being called upon to pay, both at private sale and under condemnation.

Mr. PERKINS. If the committee had known this land would cost as much as it will cost, would it have thought it wise to continue this undertaking?

Mr. ROBERTS. I am not prepared to state that. I will say to the gentleman that this site was selected by a commission provided for by legislation. A commission was provided for by act of Congress to look over the New England coast north of Cape Cod and select a suitable location for a magazine on that coast. This commission looked the coast over from Cape Cod to Eastport, and it decided that, considering the natural advantages and the amount of land available, the isolation of the land, and the probable price, this was the most desirable location. I can not say what that commission would have reported had they known the ultimate cost of the land. They might have reported in favor of some other site or some other point, but they did not.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. Mr. PERKINS. I ask unanimous consent that I may proceed for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to proceed for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. PERKINS. I wish to state that what the gentleman has just said, as it seems to me, confirms me in the wisdom of the objection I made to the appointment of a new commission a little while ago, because here we have one of these commissions that, as the gentleman says, brought in most inaccurate estimates, upon which the committee and Congress have acted to the considerable detriment of the Government, I judge from what the gentleman says.

Mr. ROBERTS. Oh, I do not agree with that. The magazine would have had to be located somewhere on that coast, and any other point would have been more expensive than this has proved to be.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from Illinois on the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, this seems to be an unusual provision in this bill. What is the occasion for building hospital quarters or medical staff quarters outside of the hospital at Pensacola?

Mr. FOSS. The present quarters now occupied by the medical staff will be thrown in to increase the hospital building for the men. That is to say, the officers will have their quarters now outside instead of inside, and that will give a larger space for the hospital inside, and in order to do that we provide for the erection of quarters of the medical staff outside.

Mr. MANN. Are these medical-staff quarters to be outside of the city altogether?

Mr. FOSS. No; near the hospital.

Mr. MANN. Well, how far away?

Mr. FOSS. Well, I do not know about that—

Mr. MANN. Uptown?

Mr. MUDD. No; the city of Pensacola is several miles away. You have to go there by trolley or ride. I think it is 7 miles from the city of Pensacola to the naval station.

Mr. MANN. They might build these medical-staff quarters in Pensacola for aught this bill provides.

Mr. FOSS. Oh, no; they have to build them in the navy-yard grounds, of course.

Mr. MANN. Why, not at all. Under the bill—I call my colleague's attention to the fact that is the reason I raised the question—there is absolutely no limitation about that at all.

Mr. FOSS. Well, that is the usual provision, and I have never known of an instance in the last twelve years where they have built outside, I will say to the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. Of course, I take my colleague's statement as to its being the usual provision, but I have never seen it in the naval appropriation bill before. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment:

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 43, line 24, after the word "dollars," insert:
"Naval hospital, Puget Sound, Washington: For the repair of naval hospital buildings, \$75,000, total cost not to exceed \$150,000."

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order against that amendment.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Mr. Chairman, on page 122 of the hearings this proposal for a hospital is recommended by the Department in the following language:

For the erection of naval hospital buildings, the cost not to exceed \$150,000, \$75,000. The existing building was designed for the navy-yard dispensary and is therefore adapted neither for hospital use nor to the hospital requirements of the station. There is but one other naval hospital on the Pacific coast of the United States. Without more ample facilities at this station, the Department will be unable to provide hospital accommodations for the sick of the Navy on the Pacific coast.

I now ask to be inserted in the RECORD, and have the Clerk read, a letter from the Surgeon-General upon the question.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the letter.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY,
BUREAU OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY,
Washington, D. C., February 1, 1907.

DEAR SIR: In reply to your letter of the 30th ultimo, requesting a letter from me giving you any information that might have a bearing upon the question of an appropriation for the erection of buildings for a naval hospital at the navy-yard, Puget Sound, Washington, and stating that when the naval bill is considered in the House, you will make an attempt to have an amendment giving an appropriation to build this hospital, I take pleasure in informing you that the necessity for a properly equipped naval hospital at Puget Sound has been recognized for several years past on account of the growing importance of the station and has been recommended to the Department. In the estimate of appropriations required for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908, the Bureau included an item for the erection of naval hospital buildings to cost not to exceed \$150,000, \$75,000 to be appropriated for the fiscal year 1908.

This item will be found in the "Estimates of Appropriations, 1908" (H. R. Doc. No. 12, 59th Cong., 2d sess., p. 512). This item was approved by the honorable Secretary of the Navy, but was not incorporated in the bill making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1908 (H. R. 24925), reported by Mr. Foss on the 25th ultimo.

The existing building at the navy-yard, Puget Sound, was designed for a navy-yard dispensary, and is therefore neither adapted for hospital use nor of sufficient capacity to meet the hospital requirements of the station. There is but one other naval hospital on the Pacific coast of the United States, located at the navy-yard, Mare Island, Cal. With the inadequate facilities for the care of the sick at this station it will be impossible for the Department to give satisfactory accommodations for those needing treatment.

During the calendar year 1905 there were admitted to the hospital

at Puget Sound from the enlisted force of the Navy 191 cases of disease, 33 cases of injury, which, with 12 cases carried over from the preceding year, made a total of 236 cases under treatment. The average number of cases under daily treatment was 17.89; the average number of days of treatment for each case was 27.66; and the total number of sick days was 6,539. In addition to the naval sick and injured above enumerated, cases of severe injury from among the workmen and other civil employees of the station are treated at the hospital and are not included in the figures above given. The number of beds that the hospital will accommodate is 16, from which it will be seen that the capacity of the hospital is at all times less than the average number of patients. At times the number of patients is considerably in excess of the capacity, when it becomes necessary to erect tents for the accommodation of the excess patients.

As this matter has received the approval of the honorable Secretary of the Navy there is no impropriety in my expressing the wish that you may be able to have the item incorporated in the bill now before the Committee of the Whole House by amendment, as suggested in your letter.

Thanking you for the interest you have manifested in this matter,

I am, very truly, yours,

P. M. RIXEY,

Surgeon-General, United States Navy.

Hon. W. E. HUMPHREY, M. C.,

House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Now, Mr. Chairman, according to the letter of the Surgeon-General, it shows that there is an average of about eighteen patients at the navy-yard and they only have sixteen beds, and it is impossible to properly take care of the sick of the Navy, and that does not include the civilian employees working in the yard. Therefore it does seem to me we ought to have more than one hospital on all the Pacific coast, especially at this time when we are spending millions of dollars to build naval vessels—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I ask two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request? [After a pause.] None is heard.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. And especially at this time when we have more vessels already constructed than we have men to man. It does seem to me when we have naval vessels without crews that we ought to take care of the few sailors we already have. In view of the fact that the Surgeon-General has recommended this hospital and that the Department has recommended it, and as we do not have adequate facilities upon the Pacific coast, I trust that this amendment will prevail.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Chairman, I think the gentleman is mistaken; we have now a hospital at Mare Island.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I said except one.

Mr. MANN. Have you one at this point?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. No; we have not.

Mr. MANN. How do you expect to repair one when you have not one there?

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. We have a dispensary—an apology for a hospital.

Mr. FOSS. The Surgeon-General has recommended several this year and we have provided for a few, but we can not provide them all in one year. The gentleman has a naval magazine there, and we can not give everything in one year. I will say to the gentleman. They can get along very well there with existing accommodations and ought to be satisfied.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. I desire to say to the chairman that when you have an average of eighteen patients and only sixteen beds and you have to put them out in tents, as they have been doing there in order to accommodate the sick, that that is not ample accommodations.

Occasionally vessels come over from the Orient after the crews have been in tropical climates, and then they have to put tents all over that yard in order to take care of them. Now, I do not think that this Government is so poor that it can not afford to appropriate \$75,000 for a hospital to take care of the few sailors it has. I do not believe that the people favor economy of that character.

Mr. FOSS. They are using tents now, whereas before they used hospitals.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. Chairman, just a word. General Rixey, in his testimony before the committee, simply emphasized what he had already stated in the letter. He said:

The naval hospital at Puget Sound has only a few beds; in fact, it is more of a sick quarters than a hospital.

He also says, in answer to a question of the chairman as to whether or not this could not be left over or whether it is very important:

All the public improvements asked for are considered of importance. The least important of the public works have been stricken out by the Bureau, and the Secretary has reduced the others. It is believed that the best interests of the sick of the coast will be conserved by making the appropriation of \$75,000 during this session of Congress, in order that the preparatory work may be started as early as possible.

And then he makes the same statement with reference to the number of beds that was set out in his letter. It does seem to me that with a thousand miles of coast line on the

Pacific coast we ought to have more than one naval hospital. And, as was said by my colleague, it seems to me that this Government of ours should not haggle about a few thousand dollars for the care of the sick of the Navy. If there is anything we ought to care for, if there is anything we ought to provide suitable and ample buildings for, it is for the sick of the Army and the Navy. And I hope that this committee will feel justified in adopting this amendment, and that the gentleman who made the point of order, or reserved the point of order, will withdraw it.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is overruled. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and the Chair announced that the yeas seemed to have it.

Mr. HUMPHREY of Washington. Division, Mr. Chairman. The committee divided, and there were—ayes 28, yeas 16. So the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Naval medical supply depot, Canacao, Philippine Islands: For the erection of a building for the United States naval medical supply depot on the grounds of the naval hospital, Canacao, \$25,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order against that paragraph. What is the character of the building that is proposed to be erected, and which is to cost \$25,000, as a storehouse?

Mr. FOSS. Why, this is a depot, at which all of the medical supplies for the Navy in the Asiatic waters are assembled and distributed. It is a depot for all kinds of medicines.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I understand that.

Mr. FOSS. The only one which we have over there.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I understand that, and at present the supplies are stored in some other building, but are somewhat crowded?

Mr. FOSS. In different buildings.

Mr. FITZGERALD. But for a storehouse for the medical supplies that are required in one hospital and upon different ships that may be in the Asiatic waters it seems to me that \$25,000 will supply a building of rather an unusual character.

Mr. FOSS. In this country I presume we would recommend at least \$100,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does the gentleman think it would cost \$25,000 to build?

Mr. ROBERTS. Undoubtedly. It is expensive to build a permanent building out there.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

PUBLIC WORKS, MARINE CORPS.

Barracks and quarters, Marine Corps: For construction of officers' quarters, navy-yard, League Island, Pa., to cost \$30,000, \$30,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order against that, and I would like to ask my colleague if he would not amend that to make it read "to cost not to exceed \$30,000?"

Mr. FOSS. I have no objection to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. MANN. Insert after the word "cost," in line 10, "not to exceed."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 10, after the word "cost," insert "not to exceed."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purchase of ground adjoining the quartermasters' depot, Philadelphia, Pa., and erection thereon of an addition to said depot, not to exceed \$200,000, \$200,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on that, and I ask whether it would be acceptable to accept an amendment after the word "depot," so as to read, "the total cost not to exceed \$200,000."

Mr. FOSS. That is what it means, I will say to the gentleman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend so as to read: "At a total cost not to exceed \$200,000."

Mr. FITZGERALD. I did not understand that the point of order was withdrawn. The gentleman asked if it would be satisfactory to do that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understood the gentleman to withdraw the point of order.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I did not so understand. I intended to insist on it if it can be insisted upon.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER. There was no point of order raised on the paragraph.

Mr. MANN. I reserved the point of order. Undoubtedly the gentleman has the right to renew it.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that an amendment has been offered.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair saw the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] standing, and the Chair did not understand for what he had risen.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] reserved the point of order, and then asked if it would be acceptable to amend and insert the words which he mentioned.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will recognize the gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] to make the point of order if he so desires.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order against the paragraph.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

For construction of marine barracks, Charleston, S. C., \$30,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order against the paragraph. If I may have the attention of my colleague for a moment, there are a number of items here for marine barracks. I do not know how many additional barracks may be needed; but is this total cost of marine barracks at Charleston, S. C., \$30,000, or is that merely the commencement?

Mr. FOSS. The total cost for the present is \$30,000.

Mr. MANN. Would the gentleman be willing to accept an amendment so as to read "For the construction of marine barracks, Charleston, S. C., at a total cost not exceeding \$30,000?"

Mr. ROBERTS. For one building?

Mr. MANN. No; the way it stands.

Mr. ROBERTS. You would shut them out from increasing the size of the barracks as the number of men increased?

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I will assure my friend that for the time being that would be an ample sum of money to provide for the barracks at this point. It may come that in the future it will be necessary to have additional barracks for an increased number of men. If this amendment should become part of the bill, then no barracks, in my judgment, could be erected hereafter by means of an appropriation bill.

Mr. MANN. No barracks can be erected now unless an item is put in the bill.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. No barracks can be erected unless the item is put in the bill, but that might be construed, if it became law, that we could not hereafter enlarge the barracks upon an appropriation bill.

Mr. MANN. That is what I am trying to ascertain, whether this appropriation of \$30,000 will construct these barracks, or whether it means hereafter an appropriation of any such sum as the committee wishes to bring in. I will not make any objection to this appropriation, if that is where it stops; but now we do not know the amount of money that hereafter may be required for this purpose.

Mr. FOSS. The estimate was for \$50,000, and it read: "For barracks and officers' quarters;" and we provide here simply for the barracks for the men, \$30,000.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman's committee has authority at any time to control the situation in the proper manner.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. I am not going to delay the passage of this great bill in an argument with my friend. I can do that afterwards; but when in this House do you believe a bill for this purpose could be reached for consideration? Answer the question. It is true we have the power to legislate.

Mr. MANN. While the gentleman is upon that subject, I will state that there are carried in this bill for increases in the Navy in some way or other numerous items. The Committee on Military Affairs—and I commend its action to the gentleman upon the Committee on Naval Affairs—recently brought in a bill in the proper way. They had stated for years that under the rules that what they were trying to do in that bill could get no consideration except on an appropriation bill. Yet, after many delays, when they concluded to bring a bill in in accordance with the rules, increasing the force of the artillery, they passed it without question.

Mr. BUTLER of Pennsylvania. Under a suspension of the rules.

Mr. MANN. And if the gentleman's committee will bring in bills in the same manner, in accordance with the rules, it is probable that they can pass proper bills in a proper manner.

Mr. ROBERTS. Let me say to the gentleman from Illinois that the Naval Committee now have on the Calendar bills for increasing naval establishments, the same provisions that have carried in this appropriation bill, and the Naval Committee, nor any of its members, have been able under the rules of this House to get those bills up for consideration even.

Mr. MANN. I understand; and some of these bills a majority of the Members of this House are opposed to.

Mr. ROBERTS. I do not know.

Mr. MANN. They might as well be disposed of here as any other place, I believe.

Mr. FOSS. As far as the duty of the committee is concerned, the barracks for the Marine Corps have always been carried in the naval appropriation bill, and it is the only proper place for them.

Mr. MANN. I am not referring to this item.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois withdraw the point of order?

Mr. MANN. Unless gentlemen are willing to accept the amendment that is proposed, I shall insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, for the purpose of suggesting that it is a quarter after 5 o'clock, and that we shall make more headway, I think, by taking things in their regular order and adjourning at a regular hour. I think it would be well for the committee to rise now.

Mr. FOSS. I should like to finish this Bureau.

The Clerk read as follows:

For construction of marine barracks, naval station, Guantanamo, Cuba, \$10,000.

Mr. PERKINS. Mr. Chairman, I wish to reserve a point of order on that. This is for the construction of marine barracks in Cuba.

Mr. FOSS. We have a station at Guantanamo; not very much of a one, but there is a piece of land, I think about 5 miles square, that was set apart for a naval station in Cuba under the Platt amendment.

Mr. PERKINS. This is to erect naval barracks on that?

Mr. FOSS. This is simply to provide barracks for the marines, who are the guard looking after public property.

Mr. PERKINS. Will this be the entire expense?

Mr. FOSS. This will be the expense.

Mr. PERKINS. I withdraw the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

In all, public works, Marine Corps, \$377,000.

Mr. FOSS. I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. SHERMAN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 24925, the naval appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

GLASGOW LAND DISTRICT, MONTANA.

Mr. DIXON of Montana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 20984) to provide for a land district in Valley County, in the State of Montana, to be known as the "Glasgow land district."

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That all that portion of the State of Montana included within the present boundaries of Valley County is hereby constituted a new land district, and that the land office for said district shall be located at Glasgow, in said county.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; and was accordingly read the third time, and passed.

DAMS ON BEAR RIVER, MISSISSIPPI.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (H. R. 21194) to authorize J. F. Andrews, J. W. Jourdan, their heirs, representatives, associates, and assigns, to construct dams and power stations on Bear River, on the southeast quarter of section 31, township 5, range 11, in Tishomingo County, Miss., with a Senate amendment thereto.

Mr. CANDLER. Mr. Speaker, I move to concur in the Senate amendment.

The motion was agreed to.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 3593. An act granting an honorable discharge to Joseph P. W. R. Ross;

S. 4113. An act granting an increase of pension to Dell E. Pert;

S. 4396. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Davis;

S. 4509. An act granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Loomis;

S. 4681. An act granting an increase of pension to William S. Gray;

S. 1495. An act granting an increase of pension to John Holley;

S. 1511. An act granting an increase of pension to Marvin F. Barton;

S. 1516. An act granting an increase of pension to Orlando O. Austin;

S. 1594. An act granting an increase of pension to Margaret E. Guthrie;

S. 1797. An act granting an increase of pension to John E. Henderson;

S. 2104. An act granting an increase of pension to Moses Feyler;

S. 2139. An act to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Anton Ernst;

S. 2259. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles Duby, alias Louis Deshemean;

S. 2693. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel Wise;

S. 2780. An act granting an increase of pension to Daniel N. McCarter;

S. 2994. An act granting an increase of pension to David Harvey;

S. 362. An act granting an increase of pension to James M. Bullard;

S. 660. An act granting an honorable discharge to Peter Green;

S. 756. An act granting an increase of pension to Jacob Niebels;

S. 822. An act granting a pension to Michael V. Hennessy;

S. 1172. An act granting an increase of pension to Asaph H. Witham;

S. 1215. An act to correct the military record of William Fleming;

S. 1397. An act granting an increase of pension to Anna B. L. Walker;

S. 3668. An act to authorize the Washington, Spa Springs and Greta Railroad Company, of Prince George County, to extend its street railway into the District of Columbia;

S. 4908. An act granting an increase of pension to William H. Kimball;

S. 8065. An act to provide for the transfer to the State of South Carolina of certain school funds for the use of free schools in the parishes of St. Helena and St. Luke, in said State;

S. 5021. An act granting an increase of pension to Margaret Kearney;

S. 5023. An act granting an increase of pension to Ruth E. Olney;

S. 5041. An act granting an increase of pension to George A. Tucker;

S. 5106. An act granting an increase of pension to John Adshead;

S. 5190. An act granting an increase of pension to Abby L. Brown;

S. 5292. An act granting an increase of pension to Michael J. Sprinkle.

S. 5352. An act for the relief of William H. Osenburg;

S. 5542. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth S. Reess.

S. 5580. An act granting a pension to Julia A. Vroom;

S. 5586. An act granting an increase of pension to Albert F. Pepoon;

S. 5697. An act granting an increase of pension to George H. McLain;

S. 5374. An act granting a pension to Floyd A. Honaker;

S. 3295. An act granting an increase of pension to Anna Williams;

S. 3319. An act granting an increase of pension to James E. Croft;

S. 3461. An act granting a pension to Helen L. Woodward;

S. 3320. An act granting an increase of pension to Elias H. Parker;

S. 3583. An act granting an increase of pension to Kate O'Donnell Wood;

S. 3681. An act granting a pension to Sanford H. Moats;

S. 3882. An act granting an increase of pension to Delphine Darling;

S. 4033. An act granting an increase of pension to William Kirkwood;

S. 4055. An act granting a pension to Nancy J. Mullally;

S. 4108. An act granting an increase of pension to Martha M. Lambert;

S. 4742. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Allen;

S. 4756. An act granting an increase of pension to John Kirch;

S. 4769. An act granting an increase of pension to Rosa Olds Jenkins;

S. 4818. An act granting an increase of pension to George W. Peabody; and

S. 4813. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel Doolittle.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 8365. An act authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to cancel certain Indian allotments and substitute therefor smaller allotments of irrigable land, and providing for compensatory payments to the irrigation fund on lands so allotted within the Truckee-Carson irrigation project—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

S. 8252. An act to construct and place a light-ship at the easterly end of the southeast shoal near North Manitou Island, Lake Michigan—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 8182. An act authorizing the Twin City Power Company to build two dams across the Savannah River above the city of Augusta, in the State of Georgia—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

S. 6731. An act granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth H. Rice—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. WACHTER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, report that this day they presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H. R. 8685. An act for the relief of Charles E. Danner & Co.;

H. R. 25123. An act providing for the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River; and

H. R. 24109. An act to authorize the Norfolk and Western Railway Company to construct sundry bridges across the Tug Fork of the Big Sandy River.

LELA ELLIS.

By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. BUTLER of Tennessee, leave was granted to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of Lela Ellis (H. R. 25374), Fifty-ninth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

JAMES H. CAMPBELL.

By unanimous consent, at the request of Mr. HUNT, leave was granted to withdraw from the files of the House, without leaving copies, the papers in the case of James H. Campbell (H. R. 7675), Fifty-ninth Congress, no adverse report having been made thereon.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred, as follows:

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of the Interior submitting a supplemental statement of receipts and disbursements of funds derived from the sale of town lots in the Territory of Oklahoma—to the Committee on the Public Lands, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Governor-General of the Philippine Islands, a petition of agriculturists of the province of Negros Occidental requesting suspension of the Dingley tariff and the establishment of an agricultural bank—to the Committees on Ways and Means and Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of War submitting an estimate of appropriation for continuing the construction of the Isthmian canal—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of Commerce and Labor submitting an estimate of appropriation for light-house keepers' dwellings at Bonito Point and Mendocino, Cal.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Auditor for the Post-Office

Department submitting an estimate of appropriation for additional skilled laborers—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. TIRRELL, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2769) to divide Nebraska into two judicial districts, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 7604); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CLAYTON, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 23391) to change the time of holding the United States district courts in the eastern district of North Carolina, and to provide for the appointment of a clerk of the courts at Washington, N. C., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 7606); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ALEXANDER, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 7812) to amend section 591 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, relative to the assignment of district judges to perform the duties of a disabled judge, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 7603); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bill of the following title was reported from committee, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. MOUSER, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 17156) for the relief of Roman Scholter, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 7605); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. SMITH of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 25627) to authorize the county of Armstrong, in the State of Pennsylvania, to construct a bridge across the Allegheny River, in Armstrong County, Pa.—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SHEPPARD: A bill (H. R. 25628) to amend an act entitled "An act to adjust the salaries of postmasters," approved March 3, 1883, by increasing the compensation of fourth-class postmasters—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MURPHY: A bill (H. R. 25629) to repeal the act of February 27, 1901, granting authority to the East St. Louis and St. Louis Bridge and Construction Company, of the city of East St. Louis, Ill., to build, own, operate, and maintain a bridge across the Mississippi River—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BABCOCK: A bill (H. R. 25630) to amend an act entitled "An act to amend section 1 of an act entitled 'An act relating to the Metropolitan police of the District of Columbia,' approved February 28, 1901," approved June 8, 1906—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the legislature of Kansas, praying for the submission of a constitutional amendment to provide for election of Senators by the people—to the Committee on Election of President, Vice-President, and Representatives in Congress.

By Mr. LILLEY of Connecticut: Memorial of the legislature of Connecticut, with reference to forest reserves—to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 25631) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca S. Wishart—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BRUNDIDGE: A bill (H. R. 25632) for the relief of the heirs of Samuel Corruthers, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25633) for the relief of the heirs of Mrs. Jane Burris, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 25634) for the relief of the heirs of D. D. Patterson, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. BURTON of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 25635) granting a pension to Sophia M. Henry—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CHANEY: A bill (H. R. 25636) for the relief of William P. O'Haver—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CROMER: A bill (H. R. 25637) granting an increase of pension to Isaac H. Thornburg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DUNWELL: A bill (H. R. 25638) granting an increase of pension to John Mess—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULKERSON: A bill (H. R. 25639) granting an increase of pension to Russian B. Moody—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOULDEN: A bill (H. R. 25640) for the relief of Reed B. Granger—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HALE: A bill (H. R. 25641) granting an increase of pension to John Hayden—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINKAID: A bill (H. R. 25642) granting a pension to E. E. Hunter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCCREARY of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 25643) granting a pension to Elizabeth E. Clark—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHACKLEFORD: A bill (H. R. 25644) granting an increase of pension to Mary J. McKenzie—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TAWNEY: A bill (H. R. 25645) granting an increase of pension to W. H. Twiford—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Petition of various associations of several States and the District of Columbia, against passage of bill H. R. 13655 (the Littlefield bill)—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Lodge No. 136, Brotherhood of Railway Firemen, Sanborn Division of Locomotive Engineers, and other labor organizations, for the sixteen-hour bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ACHESON: Petition of W. W. Bair, Liberty street, Newcastle, Pa., for the sixteen-hour bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of citizens of Pennsylvania, for increase of salaries of post-office clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ADAMSON: Petition of the R. P. Cole Manufacturing Company, against reduction of railway mail pay—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of H. C. M. Fadden and Dr. F. M. Redley, of Albanto and Lagrange, Ga., against reduction of railway mail pay—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ALEXANDER: Petition of James L. McGill, meat inspector, for the bill increasing salaries of Government employees—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BARTLETT: Petition of Fain & Stamps et al., of the Atlanta Wholesale Grocers' Association, of Atlanta, Ga., for legislation to provide for reciprocal demurrage—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of W. E. Moran, of Gray, Ga.; C. W. Middlebrook & Co.; J. D. Anchors, and H. J. and J. T. Finney, of Haddock, Ga., et al., for legislation giving increased powers to Interstate Commerce Commission for regulation of the movement and unloading of interstate freight—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BRUNDIDGE: Paper to accompany bills for relief of heirs of Mrs. Burris, heirs of D. D. Patterson, and heirs of Samuel Carruthers—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. EDWARDS: Paper to accompany bill for relief of estate of Caroline Thompson—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of the American Musical Copyright League, for the Currier bill (H. R. 25133) and against the Kittredge bill (S. 8190)—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of Grand Camp of the Arctic Brotherhood, for an appropriation for Government participation in the Alaska-

Yukon-Pacific Exposition, to be held at Seattle in 1909—to the Committee on Industrial Arts and Expositions.

By Mr. GOULDEN: Petition of New York Typographical Union No. 6, for the copyright bills (H. R. 19853 and S. 6330)—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of the American Musical Copyright League, for bill H. R. 25133 (the copyright bill)—to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. HIGGINS: Petition of Carpenters and Joiners' Union, No. 97, of New Haven, Conn., and by the State Association of Connecticut, for an increase in salaries of post-office clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HILL of Connecticut: Petition of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, for increase of salaries of postal clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HINSHAW: Petition of O. S. Erwin, president of the McKinley Club, of Omaha, Nebr., asking 20 per cent increase of pay for railway postal clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HOWELL of Utah: Petition of the Utah Press Association, for a modification of the antipass provision of the rate bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the city council of Salt Lake City, Utah, for right of way to construct a boulevard through a portion of the Fort Douglas Military Reservation—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. LILLEY of Connecticut: Petition of the National Wholesale Lumber Dealers' Association, through the governors of the New England States, for the forest-reserve bill—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Petition of the Merchants' Association of New York City, for a post-office building in New York City, as per bill H. R. 24762—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of the National Convention for the Extension of Foreign Commerce in the United States, for a dual tariff—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McNARY: Petition of the Boston Society of Civil Engineers, against reduction of the appropriation for the Geological Survey to gauge streams—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the Massachusetts State Board of Trade, indorsing bill S. 4953, for forest reserves—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Daniel Fallon—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, petition of the National German-American Alliance of the United States against the Littlefield bill—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Boston Lodge, No. 97, Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen, for the sixteen-hour bill—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Springfield Board of Trade for an increase of salaries of post-office clerks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the American Musical Copyright League for bill H. R. 25133—to the Committee on Patents.

Also, petition of the Dorchester (Mass.) Helping Hand Association, against the Dillingham-Gardner bill—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the International Association of Machinists, for a new foundry at the Naval Gun Factory, Washington, D. C.—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. NORRIS: Petition of the National Convention for the Extension of the Foreign Commerce of the United States, for a dual tariff—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the women's associations of Falls City, Nebr., for the Beveridge child-labor bill—to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. OLCOTT: Petition of the National Convention for the Extension of the Foreign Commerce of the United States, for a dual tariff—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. PADGETT: Paper to accompany bill for relief of the heirs of Mrs. Jane E. Williams—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. PEARRE: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Thomas N. Gott—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. REYBURN: Petition of the National Convention for the Extension of the Foreign Commerce of the United States, for a dual tariff—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SCHNEEBELI: Petition of L. N. Cushman, of Boston, for an improved system of fractional currency—to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

Also, petition of working people of Philadelphia, against the decision of the Supreme Court in refusing to recognize the cou-

stitutional rights of Moyer, Haywood, and Pettibone—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SULZER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Harriet P. Porter, widow of Gen. Fitz John Porter—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WEBBER: Petition of citizens of the District of Columbia, for bill H. R. 6016 (prohibition of the liquor traffic in the District of Columbia)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. WEISSE: Petition of Madison Division, No. 73, Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers, for the sixteen-hour bill (S. 5133)—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the American Protective Tariff League, for a dual tariff—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of the National German-American Alliance, against bill H. R. 13655 (the Littlefield bill)—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the National Business League, of Chicago, Ill., for conservation of the public domain by revision of the land laws—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of the National Business League, of Chicago, Ill., for reform of the consular service—to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Immigration Restriction League, favoring restriction of immigration (S. 4403)—to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of the Illinois Manufacturers' Association, for a deep waterway from Chicago to St. Louis—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the Chicago Real Estate Board, for general improvement of the Chicago River in all its branches—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of the International Association of Machinists, for a new foundry for the Naval Gun Factory in Washington—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of the American Musical Copyright League, for bill H. R. 75133—to the Committee on Patents.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, February 14, 1907.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. EDWARD E. HALE.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. KEAN, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Journal stands approved.

CREDENTIALS.

Mr. CLARK of Wyoming presented the credentials of FRANCIS E. WARREN, chosen by the legislature of the State of Wyoming a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1907; which were read, and ordered to be filed.

Mr. CARMACK presented the credentials of Robert L. Taylor, chosen by the legislature of the State of Tennessee a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1907; which were read, and ordered to be filed.

JOSE MARCH DUPLAT.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of State, transmitting a note from the chargé d'affaires of Venezuela at Washington, D. C., requesting, under instruction from his Government, that permission be granted Jose March Duplat, a citizen of Venezuela, to enter the United States Military Academy at West Point, and submitting the draft of a joint resolution to carry into effect the request; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, and ordered to be printed.

FINDINGS BY THE COURT OF CLAIMS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate communications from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the findings of fact filed by the court in the following causes:

In the cause of The Trustees of the Jerusalem Evangelical Lutheran Church, of Ebenezer, Ga., *v.* The United States; and In the cause of Marie L. Hermance, administratrix of the estate of Jeremiah Simonson, deceased, *v.* The United States.

The foregoing findings were, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. BROWNING, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills:

S. 6601. An act granting to the Columbia Valley Railroad Com-

pany a right of way through Fort Columbia Military Reservation at Scarborough Head, in the State of Washington, and through the United States quarantine station in section 17, township 9 north, range 9 west of Willamette meridian, in said State of Washington, and for other purposes; and

S. 8288. An act authorizing and empowering the Secretary of War to locate a right of way for and granting the same and a right to operate and maintain a line of railroad through the Fort Wright Military Reservation, in the State of Washington, to the Portland and Seattle Railway Company, its successors and assigns.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 20984) to provide for a land district in Valley County, in the State of Montana, to be known as the Glasgow land district; in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills; and they were thereupon signed by the Vice-President:

S. 362. An act granting an increase of pension to James M. Bullard;

S. 660. An act granting an honorable discharge to Peter Green;

S. 756. An act granting an increase of pension to Jacob Niebels;

S. 822. An act granting a pension to Michael V. Hennessy;

S. 1172. An act granting an increase of pension to Asaph H. Witham;

S. 1215. An act to correct the military record of William Fleming;

S. 1397. An act granting an increase of pension to Anna B. L. Walker;

S. 1495. An act granting an increase of pension to John Holley;

S. 1511. An act granting an increase of pension to Marvin F. Barton;

S. 1516. An act granting an increase of pension to Orlando O. Austin;

S. 1594. An act granting an increase of pension to Margaret E. Guthrie;

S. 1797. An act granting an increase of pension to John E. Henderson;

S. 2104. An act granting an increase of pension to Moses Feyler;

S. 2139. An act to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of Anton Ernst;

S. 2259. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles Doby, alias Louis Deshemean;

S. 2693. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel Wise;

S. 2780. An act granting an increase of pension to Daniel N. McCarter;

S. 2994. An act granting an increase of pension to David Harvey;

S. 3295. An act granting an increase of pension to Anna Williams;

S. 3319. An act granting an increase of pension to James E. Croft;

S. 3320. An act granting an increase of pension to Elias H. Parker;

S. 3461. An act granting a pension to Helen L. Woodward;

S. 3583. An act granting an increase of pension to Kate O'Donnell Wood;

S. 3593. An act granting an honorable discharge to Joseph P. W. R. Ross;

S. 3668. An act to authorize the Washington, Spa Springs and Greta Railroad Company, of Prince George County, to extend its street railway into the District of Columbia;

S. 3681. An act granting a pension to Sanford H. Moats;

S. 3882. An act granting an increase of pension to Delphine Darling;

S. 4033. An act granting an increase of pension to William Kirkwood;

S. 4055. An act granting a pension to Nancy J. Mullally;

S. 4108. An act granting an increase of pension to Martha M. Lambert;

S. 4113. An act granting an increase of pension to Dell E. Pert;

S. 4396. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Davis;

S. 4509. An act granting an increase of pension to Anna M. Loomis;

S. 4681. An act granting an increase of pension to William S. Gray;